

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

FEBRUARY 19, 1938

WHO'S WHO

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., during late years, has been attached to the well-known Farm Street Church, London. He was educated in the Harrow-Stonyhurst-Oxford tradition. He won firsts and prizes in the classics and theology almost every time he tried. His career as lecturer in the classics and Scripture at Stonyhurst and Oxford branched out into human salvage work. During the World War his achievements and experiences at the hospitals in England were unique, but not more so than his fraternizing with the seamen on his voyages, elsewhere, and to the International Eucharistic Congresses held in Dublin, Melbourne, Buenos Aires and Manila. Among his recreations are listed social and international relations, seamen and liturgy. He is one of the most fecund writers in England, and utilizes both day and night in producing articles and books. . . . ELEANOR M. DOYLE has been engaged in Catholic educational endeavor in Chicago and Buffalo for some years. This is her first contribution to AMERICA. While pointing a major ill, it proffers a cure, but a most difficult one. . . . MAURICE C. FIELDS is known to our readers through his poems. He is a young Negro, born in Florida and schooled in New York. Having secured an A.B. from Brooklyn College, he is now pursuing his A.M., and is engaged in research work for the *Interracial Review* and the Catholic Association for International Peace.

NEXT WEEK will be published the article by Arnold Lunn which had been scheduled for the present issue. There will be also an important announcement about our "Bias Contest."

THIS WEEK

COMMENT 458

GENERAL ARTICLES

- Race Baiters Embrace God Haters
John LaFarge 460
- A Proletarian State Does Not, Can Not Exist
C. C. Martindale 462
- The Charlie McCarthys Kick Over the Traces
John Wiltbye 464
- The Bishop Plans to Open Four High Schools
Eleanor M. Doyle 465

WITH SCRIP AND STAFF ... John LaFarge 467

EDITORIALS 468

- Communists in the Unions ... Dictators ... Bigotry ... A Forgotten Address ... Mr. Madden
Replies ... Federal Medicine ... The Sower.

CHRONICLE 471

CORRESPONDENCE 473

LITERATURE AND ARTS

- Shall We Star the Saints? ... Maurice C. Fields 475

BOOKS REVIEWED BY 477

- Ends and Means George Bull
Oliver Pollock: The Life and Times of an Unknown Patriot Gilbert J. Garraghan
Moulders of Destiny Gerald G. Walsh

THEATRE Elizabeth Jordan 479

FILMS Thomas J. Fitzmorris 480

EVENTS The Parader 480

Editor-in-Chief: FRANCIS X. TALBOT.

Associate Editors: PAUL L. BLAKELY, JOHN LAFARGE, GERARD DONNELLY,
JOHN A. TOOMEY, LEONARD FEENEY, WILLIAM J. BENN, ALBERT I. WHELAN.

Editorial Office: 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Business Manager: FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE.

Business Office: 53 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK CITY.

AMERICA. Published weekly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., February 19, 1938, Vol. LVIII, No. 20, Whole No. 1480. Telephone Barclay 7-8993. Cable Address: Cathreview. United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly \$4.00; Canada, \$4.50; Europe, \$5.00. Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. AMERICA, A Catholic Review of the Week, Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

COMMENT

BIAS in the newspapers against Catholic beliefs and sympathies has become more deadly and more persistent. Prejudice in the weekly and monthly magazines against the Church and its teachings has been increasing. Scarcely a day passes without bringing us letters from various parts of the country pointing out to us the slurs, the innuendos, the falsifications, the attacks being made against things and persons Catholic. During March, we are intending to hold a *Bias Contest*. Full announcement of the rules and procedure will be made next week by Father Toomey. The idea, however, is this: from the first till the thirty-first of March, scan your local newspapers, your weekly and monthly magazines; pick out the item that seems to you to show a definite anti-Catholic slant; write a hundred, but not more than a two hundred word note specifying why you think this item is the most anti-Catholic of the month. Prizes will be given to those who send the worst samples and the best letters. Prizes are also contemplated for award to the papers or magazines which are most offensive. Prepare to enter into the spirit and the fun of tracking down the most disreputable news-item by entering the great and only *Bias Contest*. It is our secret hope, however, that all the newspapers and magazines will behave themselves so admirably that we shall have no occasion to award the prizes.

— — —

DEFEND as they will the Government's economic policies in the face of the charges of unstability and "flitting" as tacked on to the Administration by the ebullient "little business" men, the fact remains that the champions of the cause only seem to emphasize all the more the charge of flitting. The Administration realized that something had to be done to restore a status of financial normalcy in the country, but the measures first adopted, then pushed vigorously, and finally scrapped for some newer scheme give the general impression that the Government "doesn't know where it's going, but it's on its way." Economists, generally, will admit that they were completely stumped by the crisis of 1929, and most theories that had been formerly advocated by the "authorities" as universally sound, were found to be about as useful as an umbrella in a tornado. No issue can be taken with the Government for scrapping theories and practices that in the stress of the times had been found impractical or useless. The pity of it is that some of the Government's "brain specialists" have been too stubborn about some of their pet theories and have continued to enforce their application on business when it is obvious to all that they are incapable of effecting their purpose, at least for the present, or are seriously injurious to the proposed business recuperation which they aim to remedy.

The country's business does not need any more pump-priming at present. It needs assurance of security and stability with increasingly less interference on the part of the Administration and infinitely less centralization.

— — —

NATURALLY it was to be expected that Japan would not care to assume responsibility for precipitating a naval-race program. Her sponsorship of the Olympic Games in 1940 will be quite enough for her in the field of races at the present time, thank you, with an undeclared war against China on her hands. That an attempt would be made to shift the blame on Great Britain, France and the United States was a foregone conclusion. It was not surprising, then, that official Japanese newspapers announced to their readers the American and British notes were merely an evasion to put the responsibility on Japan. However, when a correspondent in an interview with a spokesman for the Japanese Foreign Office asked pointedly if it were not true that Japan was actually engaged in constructing capital ships above the 35,000 ton limit set by the London Conference, no reply was forthcoming. As far as can be observed, Japan has no obligation to restrict her naval construction to the limits set down by the latest London parley, since she was not a signatory to the pact. Neither on the other hand has she any obligation to answer the notes other than with some polite "nothings." But failure to do so satisfactorily does put her in the position of permitting the three Powers the privilege of evoking the "escalator" clause of the London treaty. These "friendly" notes have put Japan on the spot.

— — —

"BETWEEN the census years of 1920 and 1930 the number of married women in the United States increased by 4,851, while the number of children under five years of age decreased by 128,840." The writer in the February *Forum* who gives these startling figures goes on to say that this decline is continuous and is not the result of any depression. The 1920 decade was a golden age of prosperity, and yet a twenty per cent drop in the birth rate from 1920 to 1930 is the record. And he tells us that the judicious chronicler of 2,000 A.D. will note as the most revolutionary happening in America after the World War the great and steady decline of the birth rate. "He will no doubt give space to Ford, Lewis, Roosevelt and the other great ones of our time, but I have a strong suspicion that the activities of a woman named Margaret Sanger will also come in for considerable attention." Indeed, Margaret and her active cohorts have assured themselves undying fame in a very questionable and un-

savory crusade. Other factors besides the Church's opposition to birth control go into the low birth-rate of the three New England States mentioned, while New Mexico with its high birth-rate and without penal legislation against the spread of knowledge of contraceptives stands high in its Catholic population. Birth prevention is one of the most serious, but only one of the sad effects of our trying to get along without God and revealed religion in America today.

UNFAIR recruiting and "fierce competition for students," so deplored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, are not to be discovered in the newly opened Ateneo de Zamboanga, Jesuit college under the Equator. Students there are clamoring to get in, and the only problem that Walter J. Hyland, S.J., Dean of the college, has to consider is that of housing the students and providing books for their use. Zamboanga is a small, neat town at the southernmost tip of the Island of Mindanao in the Philippines. American business men and representatives of industries there meet Christian Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese and Moros. The latter still practise polygamy and slavery, a shrewd, cunning and warlike tribe. Modest as is the college's beginning, growing out of a high school begun in 1928 by Thomas J. Murray, S.J., now Dean of the Manhattan Division of Fordham College and Regent of the Fordham School of Business, its sphere of influence holds possibilities as great as those of the greatest schools of the world. Trade and industry in the Far East threaten to rival, if not to overtop, the economic life of the Western nations. The youth educated there by American Catholic and Filipino Catholic missionaries will, in time, gain the Orient for Christ. Watch the growth of the College of Zamboanga!

THE thirty-second annual report of the Carnegie Foundation of Teaching features the "high pressure" methods of many institutions of higher learning to recoup the depleted exchequer with tuition-paying students. This is a somewhat different angle to the educational situation revealed in former reports of "the many institutions of higher learning" that held the bait of scholarship and other financial prerequisites dangling in unseemly competition before the eyes of promising but impoverished potential athletes. Perhaps the Foundation in turning the light on the new practices feels the latter situation is met today in a more seemly fashion or that the practice has become respectable through natural evolution and extension. But there is a saving note of cheer in the report which tended to beget in our bosom a surge of resentment at the bald commercialism involved. It seems that art, flare and color are not yet extinct in our universities. Tuba players and drum majors are in special demand. Having witnessed the trimmings of the football games, we can well understand the marketableness of the drum major and are doubly pleased that it will not be "hogged" by the "unfair" sex as was the case in

collegiate football. As for the tuba player, small historical investigation will trace his honorable and honored lineage back at least to Greece, B.C.

HIGH time it is that the ranks of labor come to realize which way the subtle Communist leaders, who have wormed their way into the unions, would direct their activities. In some cases, the Maritime Union, for example, these traitors to Americanism have succeeded in their revolutionary tactics. Hence, the sound common sense of the remarks of Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers, deserve to be recorded. Mr. Martin speaking for his union called for the elimination of Red leadership and influence, which he characterized as "destructive of labor's best interests." The leader of the automobile workers is in a position to know, since the hard-earned victory of recognition of the union in this industry was nearly nullified by the subversive activities of the Communist group in the ranks. It is not the American way, proclaimed Mr. Martin, to make a contract with an employer and then not live up to it. Russian influence and propaganda is insidiously making inroads into labor circles under the cover of "the hue and cry about Nazism and Fascism." Mr. Martin, following what AMERICA has always advocated, would not exclude Communists as Communists from the union, but he insists that no Communist should have any leadership in the union.

WHEN TERUEL was surrounded by Spanish Reds and the citadel, some think by treachery, was surrendered on January 7, the Bishop of Teruel, Most Rev. Anselmo Polanco, was found among the prisoners. It was announced then by the Loyalist authorities that his life had been spared. This was apparently regarded as an exceptional act of clemency, so much was it heralded. It was, indeed, an indication of a modified policy, since the Loyalist Government, directly or indirectly, executed in a sure and summary manner all bishops, priests and religious who fell under their power in the earlier stages of the Civil War. Now we learn from Barcelona sources that the Bishop of Teruel is awaiting trial, and possible execution. The crime urged against him is that he signed the *Joint Letter of the Spanish Bishops*, issued on July 1, 1937 to the Bishops of the world. The weekly resume of the Spanish Information Service, published in Barcelona on January 21, alleges that Bishop Polanco is "a dignitary of the Church who has taken an active part in the war, in favor of the rebels," and that "the prelate awaits the decision of the Law, which has not been broken either for him or for any other prisoner taken there (Teruel)." If the "Law" is interpreted in the Barcelona fashion, there is little hope for the Bishop. From London comes the news that some one impersonating the Bishop has spoken over the Red radio praising the treatment accorded the prisoners by the Loyalists. Will Bishop Polanco be another Spanish martyr?

RACE BAITERS EMBRACE GOD HATERS

Odd lesson of two "liberal" postcards

JOHN LaFARGE, S.J.

TODAY I received in the mail what at first sight I took to be a belated New Year's greeting. It showed a smiling young Jeanne, Liberty cap and all. Bowing and dancing up to her from one side were a diminutive John Bull and a willowy Uncle Sam, with the weird leer these venerable figures take on when Latin artists manipulate them. To the left stood a huge, vague figure, wrapped in a military coat with a five-pointed star on his peaked cap. The Spanish text below explained that these were the good friends of struggling Loyalist Spain: Soviet Russia, France, Great Britain and the United States.

Uncle Sam's presence on the postcard would have been more convincing if there had been lined up behind him countenances of sixty members of Congress who sent a message of congratulation to the Spanish Cortes on January 30. Msgr. Ready, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the New York Chapter of the National Catholic Alumni Federation, not to speak of AMERICA, have already expressed an opinion as to the conduct of these gentlemen, whose apparent aim is to involve the United States in a world war. Enough has been said to have elicited a speedy repudiation of the whole affair by at least six of the sixty, who now request that their names be stricken from the document. A study, however, of those who signed and who have not to date repudiated doing so reveals an interesting fact.

Sixteen or more fat issues of the *Congressional Record* are filled with current filibuster against the Wagner-Van Nuys Anti-Lynching Bill, in which event Senators Connally, Ellender and Pepper took a prominent part, along with the Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo and a squad of other professional vindicators of pure white supremacy.

According to Mr. Bilbo, "the presence of the Negro race has been the greatest curse that has ever been visited upon the South. The shadow of the Ethiopian that has been cast across the white fields of Dixie, has been darker and more ominous than the fatal night that passed over Egypt. He has caused privation, suffering and shame beyond the power of omnipotence to measure." The Ethiopian, complained Mr. Bilbo, "is the one obstacle that has stood in the way of the industrial development of the South."

The Hon. Allen E. Ellender, of Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana, who was Bilbo's runner-up in the marathon of talking, also received a postcard:

I have in my pocket a picture as evidence to show the respect and the admiration the South as a whole has for the law-abiding Negro. I received a post-card this morning sent from a town in Natchitoches Parish, La. On the post-card appears the picture of a monument to an old Negro, who stands on a granite pedestal respectfully bowing his head, and on that granite pedestal is inscribed a tribute by the Southern people to the colored race:

"Erected by the city of Natchitoches, La., in grateful recognition of the arduous and faithful service of the good darkies (*sic*) of Louisiana."

Just how this agrees with Mr. Bilbo's dictum that the Negro is the greatest curse ever visited upon the South is not so clear, or what it has to do with the Anti-Lynching Bill. But perfectly clear, illumined by hours of oratory, is what Mr. Ellender means by a "good darky." He is an individual who recognizes, and shows in every possible fashion of subservience that he is essentially a subhuman creature, created by God and born for one purpose alone, to assist the white man in acquiring and enjoying material wealth and comfort. If he fulfils that purpose he is tolerated and may even get a statue in Natchitoches Parish; if he fails to understand that such is his sole destiny in life, and "develops impertinence," he is a human fiend and the sooner got rid of the better.

Mr. Ellender is not content with mere assertion. Exigencies of the filibuster as well as senatorial dignity require a scientific foundation for the doctrine of the essential inferiority of the Negro. This is at hand in the learned work, *Race or Mongrel*, by Schultz, "the book from which I read yesterday with reference to the Egyptians." Chapter X of this treatise, entitled *The Hindus*, begins thus, in the Senator's quotation:

The Hindus were one of the Aryan races. That is, they belong to the people who called themselves "Aryans" (the noble, the honorable). When they came to India, they found a mass of yellow-black-white mongrels, and recognized that the absorption of this mass was impossible. They also recognized that crossing with these people would destroy the Hindus quickly. . . .

The Hindus recognized that, unless they took vigorous precautions, the Aryans would soon be lost in the mongrel herd. To protect themselves they

invented the caste system, one of the greatest inventions of the human mind.

But the downfall came. The pure Aryans were mixed with the sub-humans.

The Hindus were a great race. Their death was a loss to the world, a loss that it is impossible to estimate. Men who call themselves Hindus still exist, Sanscrit derivatives are still spoken, the Hindu spirit, however, is dead; the noble blood has been lost in the Indian quagmire, in the yellow-black-white swamp.

The history of the Hindus, like that of the Jews, proves that race is more important than home, country, flag and everything else put together.

Great was the Hindu; worthless is the mongrel.

Read *Indian Wisdom* by Monier Williams; *The Inequality of the Human Races*, by A. Comte de Gobineau; *Volkstum und Weltmacht in der Geschichte*, by Albrecht Wirth.

To which we may add: read *Mein Kampf*, by Adolf Hitler, and *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*, by Rosenberg (the latter with permission of the Ordinary, if you are a Catholic), and you will be equipped with a complete Nazi doctrine of essential race superiority, "more important than home, country, flag and everything else put together," including such trifles as religion, Christianity and the natural law, as "everything else."

That the Senator was not being misled, but was quoting the genuine doctrine of essential "Aryan" supremacy, is pledged by the erudite Schultz' source of information, Count Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, a Frenchman who shares with an Englishman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the honor of being the ideological inspiration for that Nordic Aryan, Germany's Commander-in-Chief and *Führer*.

Considerable confusion came when some of the filibusterers appealed to the doctrine of States' rights against the application of the Fourteenth Amendment under proposed Federal legislation, for they happened to be individuals who were also ardent advocates of the wages-and-hours bill, attacked by Senator Tydings of Maryland on the ground of States' rights. Hasty retreat was beaten to the early Egyptians and the Hindu Kshatriyas. After all, as Senator Ellender observed, we are no longer living in "the old horse-and-buggy days"; "we are now living in a new environment, under extremely new conditions in comparison to those conditions that prevailed when our forefathers drafted our basic law."

Here is where I must pinch myself to make sure I am not dreaming—these glorifiers of the aged servitor with hat in hand, these ardent converts to the approved doctrine of racial and Aryan supremacy, these disciples of Monier Williams and the Count de Gobineau, are none the less "liberals," glorying in a "changing world." They are not hauling down old tomes and looking up Babylonian history when it comes to Federal legislation that will enable them better to compete with other employers of human labor. They are so liberal that they can clasp hands with the Reds, and given the opportunity, stick to the Communist Party line.

Let us get the picture. Senator Ellender, of Louisiana, fills the hall of the Senate for days with pagan appeals to racial prejudice and racial discrimination and shreds and tatters of "Aryan" lore,

of that "idolatrous cult of race" which Pope Pius XI has stigmatized as totally abhorrent to Christian teaching, that cult which is now being used as a powerful engine against the Catholic Church. The principles that he advocates would wreck all the mission work of the Catholic Church in the United States, were they carried to their full conclusion.

Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, aids patiently in the filibuster, prompting the orators by a leading question when their fervor appears to flag. Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida, appeals to the Constitution and States' rights.

Yet these same men, Messrs. Connally, Ellender and Pepper send over their own signatures a fervent message of congratulation to the Reds of Spain, to the forces allied with and directed by Soviet Russia, to the Communists and anarchists responsible for the cold-blooded murder of thousands of priests and the murder and worse than murder of thousands of nuns, the wreckers of culture and civilization in Spain and the would-be destroyers of peace throughout the world. "Your struggle," say Connally, Ellender and Pepper, "sets a stirring example to all democratic peoples. As members of one democratically elected Parliament to another, we salute you."

Extremes meet, in the racial field as in all other fields of human doctrine and policy. Those who pose as ultra-conservatives are nine times out of ten the first to be won to ultra-radical causes. Unable to distinguish between passion and moral principle, they are captured by anti-social schemers with a bait of material gain or appeals to patronage and prestige. The racist radical, ready to exploit his "subhuman" fellow man for his own material ends, salutes the Red radical, who exploits men for the benefit of the omnipotent state. We may wonder how the same person who hails the Hindu caste system as "one of the greatest inventions of the human mind" can also say that he "cherishes freedom and democracy above all else." But if you reflect that the type of democracy he favors is the type exemplified in the ruined churches and schools of Spain, the correspondence is not quite so difficult to understand. He would doubtless feel equally at home under the caste system that is now the mode in Russia. As Mr. Tydings has said, the Senator's "consistency makes him inconsistently consistent."

There are some who say that it is a calamity that such an exhibition should have taken place in our Senate. It was a disgrace. Of that there is no doubt. But it may not have been a calamity. It is well that there should have been shown to the American people once and for all the hollowness of the term "liberal" so eagerly claimed by these men, who are avid for "advanced" social legislation when it suits their own interests. It is well that people know that God-hatred and race-hatred are but two branches from the same tree. And the future will soon show, I believe, that there are many thousands of truly "liberal" men and women in Louisiana and other parts of the South who are fully aware of these facts, and whose innate sense of justice and charity will provide an unpleasant awakening for the filibusterers who sent a love-message to the Reds.

A PROLETARIAN STATE DOES NOT, CAN NOT EXIST

Soviet Russia is a bureaucracy and a tyranny

C. C. MARTINDALE

ONE has to ask, first, what the words mean, at least what Proletarian means, and whether a Proletarian State is possible, let alone likely to arise.

By proletarian most men mean, I suppose, the working-class. Not but what that is, itself, a very difficult word to define. Do I, for example, not belong to it? Does not the Pope or the President? The working-class, if we do not, must consist only of men who do one sort of work, presumably with their hands. However, no one can tie working-class down to meaning only that. Proletarian ought to mean people about whom nothing else can be said than that they produce children (*proles*). But much more can be said about every existing man or woman nowadays. There were those, said Horace, who were just "born to eat." A collectivity of such persons might be imaginable in lands where you had only to put out your hand to pick a fig, a grape, an ear of corn; and to stoop to drink out of a spring. But there are few such lands, if any; and even where there have been, men have always started to work: they grind the corn for bread; they build ovens; they crush the grapes for wine and make wine-presses; they invent a method of getting the water out of the spring when it is in a deep well. Finally, one man will have a well, or will make better bread or wine, when others have not or cannot. Then barter, and sale, and differentiation of classes according to intelligence, if not possessions, will come about. There are not, and cannot be, human people who exist merely to eat, or to produce children. And where there is a state, there is a government of some sort.

Let us assume, then, that it means a state, i.e., an organized collectivity of humans, in which everyone is equal, has an equal voice in the management of affairs; is equally equipped with what he needs.

We ask next whether there is any symptom in the modern world of any such state coming to exist. We can see none at all. We have been told that Russia was at any rate tending in that direction. We now know that it is not. Frenchmen will have read of André Gide, who went to Russia with high hopes, believing himself a Communist. He returned still thinking he was one, but the most disgruntled man you can imagine, since he found no trace of Communism there.

In Russia there is no attempt at equalization of salaries. Intellectualists and the army receive vastly greater sums than hand-workers do. Money can be inherited; and it can be invested. A new set of titles has been invented. The murdered Tsar has been resurrected, only under a new name. It is queer how the new Russian likes to change his name. What have not Mr. Apfelbaum, Mr. Finckelstein become? Even Stalin, the Steel-man, is not Stalin, though he is a Georgian. Pay for work is different according to amount of work, and amount depends on speed of work. In the collieries, it is the women who do actually more heavy work than the men.

So, if a Proletarian State is to be prayed for, it is not from Russia, apparently, that the answer to that prayer will come. Nor, to be frank, from anywhere else. Economic Communism has, in short, been wholly given up in Russia. Russia is a dictatorship, with a colossal bureaucracy and coercion.

Certainly we are not surprised that all over the world experiments are being tried as regards authority. The earlier Russian revolutionary philosophy deceitfully declared that it looked for the time when men should have "no power." But authority connotes power. It is not Russia which is even tending toward the creation of a powerless, because unauthoritative state.

The only group that I can recall which imagines it is, is that of the Spanish anarchists, who seriously do demand a world in which there exists no money, no marriage, no law of any sort. Merely to defy existing laws on principle, by no means involves the end of authority. The boss of a set of gangsters is very authoritative. At his word, subordinates can instantly be put on the spot, and are. In England, it is extremely hard to persuade anyone that the true anarchist even exists. I do not think he really does: but there are plenty of men who *think* they are anarchists and even form an entire party in Spain—instantly producing, of course, authoritative men who control the others, or try to. But no country that I know of is aiming at anarchy; but, on the contrary, at some version of authority.

Where the old-fashioned liberalism had its way, and it was "free competition"—every man for himself, and the weakest to the wall, and the devil

take the hindmost, and "some men are born to fleece and the others to be fleeced"—so much misery for the multitudes came about, that every decent man began to see that that could not be the proper method of living. Hence the problem remained: What is? Landlords exacted cruel rents; hence "land" must be "controlled." Rents must be controlled, whether the property be landed or not; so men have begun to build microscopic flats, one on the top of the other, in order to get many small rents if they cannot get big ones.

What I read today in a Sunday newspaper, that the world is divided, not between the "haves" and the "have-nots" but between those who know and those who do not, and that the "knowers" are America, France and England, and the "know-nots," Italy, Germany and Japan, is perfectly untrue. In England, too, true information can be suppressed and distorted, and false news can be fabricated or at least transmitted, as it constantly is about Spain. The word democracy is on everybody's lips; but I do not see any anywhere. The more we get local authority, the more apathetic the voter becomes.

The upshot is: If you could get a Proletarian State composed of good men, Catholics would be perfectly happy within it. So they would, under a perfectly good monarchy. They are not happy where injustice and uncharity prevail, and where the rights of God are attacked. Yet, let us imagine a society composed entirely of proletarians, apparently working with their hands. It seems that they would have to abdicate all scientific research or even applied science, and all art and literature. For unless someone could tell them that so and so must not, for reasons of state, work with his hands, but must be given a special education, leisure and remuneration, the uneducated working-man would not know what was good art and what was not; why research into the chemical construction of the stars had any social value (and has it?); why anyone should write poems or novels in which they see no beauty nor take the slightest interest.

No one has worse taste than the semi-educated, or is more liable to be taken in, like all who prate about being the "intelligentsia."

But if you consider what professes to be the nearest approximation to a Proletarian State, you will find it based on what they call by the semi-Hegelian formula: Dialectic Materialism. "Dialectic" was inherited by Marx from Hegel and dates from the days when he was, said he, "flirting" with him. Materialism is his own, or his successors' contribution to the hybrid phrase. You would, therefore, find in such a State the denial of God and of soul, and of the value of the individual—the perfect idea of person being a Christian creation, due to the perception that each man is of immeasurable value, owing to his being not only "moral," i.e., capable of conscience-choices, and not only immortal, but definitely the child of God, and having that value which God sees him to have, and intends him increasingly to have, and imperishably to possess in its perfection. This slow development of the idea of the individual person living in society crystal-

ized itself, during the Middle Ages, in the expression: *Liber et Legalis Homo* (the free man freely living in a society).

This, in different ways, yet equally, is at present sacrificed in Germany and in Russia. In the absolute state, then, the individual finds himself pulped. He may not only not act as he pleases with due regard for the equal claim of other individuals to do so; but he is not to be allowed to *think* as he pleases; and, strictly speaking, he has no power to make any choices, let alone contracts. The *Führer* is reported, not long ago, as saying: "The individual has *no* liberty, save to put himself at the service of the state." And this idea was explicitly contrasted with what was held "elsewhere," i.e., in England. In such a state, then (for, in the lack of any Proletarian State, existing or on the horizon, we have to take what we can get), the Catholic would find himself (as he does) in the most extreme discomfort, mounting up towards martyrdom—financially, certainly; of personal independence, certainly; of blood, all too often. In one way or another, whoever (school-master, for example, or parent, or priest) would not promise to say exactly what the men in power told him to, would be "liquidated," as the Russian voter knows he is morally (i.e., immorally) certain to be, if he does not vote for the solitary candidate proposed to him by the Government. There is no one else for him to vote for: and if he does not vote at all, that is just as bad as voting against his temporary tyrant.

So far as I can see—this is now a personal view—in Italy the State does want the maximum of cooperation between each individual and his governors; it is, in reality, indifferent to religion. But the Pope is a fact and so is the Church, and Mussolini takes facts into consideration. In Germany, as a shrewd observer has said, the people are like sand, and require very violent pressure to make it cohere into, so to say, even sandstone. But, as someone else (independently) said, the Germans have always needed a myth to keep themselves going. For a short time, Wotan, Siegfried myths have been invoked: but really nowadays no one can make serious use of that, and the realist Mussolini has never tried to revive a cult of the Divine Augustus, let alone *Iupiter Capitolinus* or even of Romulus.

The only conclusion is, that there is not, there is no tendency toward, there never can exist a Proletarian State. So there can be no real question of what Catholic life within one would be. In what considers itself to approximate to one, Catholic life is at present pretty wretched.

Let me end by making it perfectly clear that I hold *all* states, at present, to be full of injustice, and that Catholics do not see that clearly enough; and that even when they do, they do not, for the most part, act upon their principles; they do not see themselves as a "peculiar" people, and set their faces, and pit their forces, in the name of Christ, against the contemporary version of greed, injustice, cruelty, lustfulness, and all the current idolatries. If they did, they would probably be killed—at least by starvation. But they do not. "Would that thou wert hot or cold!"

THE CHARLIE McCARTHY'S KICK OVER THE TRACES

JOHN WILTBYE



ONE of the surprises in life is finding out how often we are wrong. As the years pile on, ossifying our brains and slowing down our sense-perceptions, we ought to grow used to being wrong. But we don't!

Last week I allowed myself to adopt the opinion of a small business man about that conference of small business men which someone (no one is anxious to claim responsibility) called to "confer" with the President. He said that the meeting would be composed of a lot of stooges and Charlie McCarthy's. I am unable to shift the blame on my friend, since, frankly, I had the same opinion myself.

But I was wrong. A lot of Charlie McCarthy's would not have informed the President that "if American leaders, as represented by the Federal Government, would light some place and maintain a constant perch rather than flit about like a canary, American business would find encouragement." The censor drew his blue pencil through this perfectly accurate diagnosis before the report reached the President, but that was not the fault of the small business men. Nor would a lot of McCarthy's have offered that other piece of advice (also blue-penciled) in which they suggested that Messrs. Jackson and Ickes be sent back to their proper work so that "unwarranted and malicious attacks on business by Administration representatives" could be "permanently stopped."

Unfortunately, the Government used so many blue pencils in editing the report of this rip-roaring convention, that, as I am credibly informed, blue pencils are now being sold at a premium along the Potomac. Worse, I very much fear that the President, unless he reads the newspapers, will never know what the small business men said in their convention, and what they want. He will get a version of what somebody who is not a small business man, but a supporter of the Administration's policy, whatever it may happen to be at the time, thinks that they should have said, and ought to want.

If this affair was supposed to end in a conference, both the President and the small business men are put in an awkward predicament. In the days of my youth, I once found myself in a compartment in a French train with two companions, one a gentleman from what is now known as Yugoslavia and the other a Gaul. They were friendly talkative creatures, but the only language we shared in common was hardly a language at all, since it was made up of what we remembered of our Latin at school. What they wanted from me was (a) a comprehensive explanation of the Constitution of the United States, and (b) why were all Americans rich? The conference lasted up to the Italian border, and I have at times speculated as to the notions

which I conveyed to them. But now I have another theme on which I can speculate next summer, as I nod of an afternoon in the shade of my favorite apple-tree. What notions were conveyed to the President by that blue-penciled report of the convention of the small business men?

But on some points, even the expurgated report is clear enough. These men agree that social reform is necessary, "but urge that it not be so rapid as to disrupt industry." Business will flourish, they believe, "when relationships between government and business are more clearly charted."

Hence they ask simplification of the tax laws and clarification of the anti-trust laws. The undistributed-profits tax should be repealed, and the income-tax base be broadened. Public expenditures should be curtailed, for they condemn the theory that the Government can spend us back to prosperity as unsound. If much of the relief work can be turned back to the local communities, there is a chance that the budget can be balanced. They do not favor the wage-and-hours bill, since "geographical differences" make it impracticable, at least in its present form. The National Labor Relations Board should be investigated by Congress, and "employer and employee alike be held responsible for the faithful observance of mutual labor agreements."

In general, the attitude of the small business men does not differ essentially from that shown in the report submitted by the "big business men" on January 10. In both is found a feeling that many of the plans now vigorously pushed by the Administration will not quicken recovery, but hinder it. Put in another way, it was the belief of the convention that the Government and business should work together to end the depression. But if the Government does not seem to know its own mind, business men cannot be expected to guess it and remain in business, for business cannot be continued profitably on guesses.

As to business, big and small, the Government's attitude is unintelligible. One branch of the Government offers to cooperate with public utilities in ending their difficulties, and another threatens to destroy these utilities by going into the same line of business. One official calls for a vigorous prosecution of all big business, and his superior declares that only ten per cent of big business is "bad." The Government declares that business should support its employees in slack times by drawing on its reserves, and at the same time prepares legislation making impossible the amassing of reserves by any business. How can business cooperate?

Business can probably manage to get along, no matter what the Government does, provided that it stops short of confiscation. But it cannot take care of the present and look to the future, if it has a well-grounded suspicion that the Government has no plans, except those which opportunism suggests from day to day. Under such conditions, one might as well talk of cooperation with an ameba.

Well, after all, the meeting did not turn into a Charlie McCarthy tea. In spite of the blue pencil, the small business man managed to put his views across—to the country, at least.

THE BISHOP PLANS TO OPEN FOUR HIGH SCHOOLS

But he needs much aid from Providence and his people

ELEANOR M. DOYLE

THE Publicity Committee burst into Miriam Turner's studio on their way from the Federated Alumnae meeting.

"You missed it, Miriam! The Bishop was there!" Harriet tossed aside her wraps and sank into her favorite armchair.

"I'm broken-hearted too! Out-of-town pupils! Simply impossible!" Miriam rolled a table out from a corner. "Draw up your chairs, girls. I'll have tea in a moment. Start in on these while you tell me about it."

Genevieve clapped her hands. "I've an idea! Harriet can read you her notes. She took it all in shorthand."

"Well, Miriam, here's the big news. The Bishop is about to open a new Catholic high school—one thousand pupils, my dear—right in the most crowded part of town, at Brown and Sylvester."

"And three more like it in the next three years!" added Genevieve with dramatic emphasis. "And he intends to use every teaching order in the diocese to staff these four schools!"

"It will never in the world succeed, though! It's too Utopian!" Harriet concluded.

Alice looked up slyly. "Is that last remark in your notes, Thomas?"

"I think Harriet is right. I have my doubts about the plan, too," announced Genevieve. "Of course, everybody knows our Bishop can work wonders. But this is impossible. It won't go."

"Girls," pleaded Miriam, looking around the table helplessly, "won't somebody please start at the beginning? Why a new Catholic high school? Aren't there *twenty* in the city now?"

With solemnity Harriet picked up her sheaf of notes. "Miriam, that is what you were supposed to ask. The Bishop began by speaking of Catholic high school education in the whole country. Here are his words:

"There are at present about 980,000 Catholic boys and girls enrolled in secondary schools in the United States. According to the last N.C.W.C. biennial survey, our Catholic high schools are educating less than 285,000. That leaves approximately 700,000 Catholic students in public high schools!

"These appalling figures were arrived at in the following manner: The enrolment in Catholic high

schools represents just a fraction over 1.3 per cent of our total Catholic population in the States, 20,735,000. But the Federal Report gives the total high-school enrolment in the land at 4.7 per cent of the entire population. Hence if our Catholic families are at least as large as other families (and who can doubt that?), and if they live in those sections where compulsory education laws reach the high-school level, it is clear that considerably more than two-thirds of our own boys and girls are in non-Catholic secondary institutions."

"That is alarming," exclaimed Miriam. "But that's for the entire country. It can't be so in our large cities, with all their splendid opportunities for Catholic education."

"That's even worse," Genevieve asserted. "Read those figures, Harriet."

"He said he had made a list of thirty episcopal Sees whose total population embraces over 14,000,000, or more than two-thirds of all our Catholics. His list includes all archdioceses in the United States and those other Sees whose populations exceed 200,000 Catholics. Here are the startling facts about these great Catholic centers, as he gave them to us:

"In the five largest Sees, the Catholic population totals over five million. Considering these five together, we find that out of every thousand Catholics, there are but thirteen students in Catholic secondary schools, while thirty-four are in public high schools. Taken separately, these five greatest centers show a variation from 1.7 per cent at one extreme to .9 per cent at the other. Again, for the ten Sees foremost in order of population, as well as for the first fifteen, and also for the first twenty, the Catholic high school percentage drops to 1.1 per cent. Thus in these twenty groups which include three-fifths of the Catholics in the land, not thirteen, but only eleven out of every forty-seven of our boys and girls in high schools are receiving a Catholic training.

"As to the thirty largest centers with their more than 14,000,000 Catholics, we discover that our own secondary schools in these great cities and their surrounding towns are enrolling approximately one-fourth of our high school students. Three only—and these among the smaller centers on the list—

report nearly a half of their high-school boys and girls as being trained in their Faith. But ten large Sees report less than one-fifth, and eight report one-sixth or fewer of their young people in attendance at Catholic high schools, while the rest are in the camp of the enemy.' "

As Harriet paused for effect, Alice spoke eagerly. "Tell me, did the Bishop enlarge upon that last remark? I was called away by a reporter just then. I was sorry; for in our family they resent whatever sounds like an attack on 'the bulwark of our nation.' Mother and my aunts, you know, graduated from public high schools in the long ago; and they can't for the life of them see how things are different today."

"Here's your answer, Alice. The Bishop spoke of Catholics who, because they themselves passed unscathed through public schools of twenty, thirty, forty years ago, now look upon all charges of evil propaganda there as absurdly overdrawn. He said:

"These people will tell us that the splendid army of public high-school teachers, many of them devout Catholics, are quite able to counteract any undesirable forces which may be at work there. But one need only hear the frank reports of the students themselves, as I have been hearing them for the past several years; one need only know something of the anxieties of the really zealous teachers, as I assure you I know them, to understand how limited, how all but powerless, are even the most devoted of them to stem the terrible tide of evil at work in the public high schools everywhere. Granted that, through the Grace of God, the Faith of many of these students is still intact; that, through the frequentation of the Sacraments, the lives of many have been kept unsullied, even in that dangerous atmosphere.

"Leaders, many of these students undoubtedly will be. But in what cause? What influences are preparing them for the conflict, which cannot be far off? We know that this battle of the future, which may indeed arrive before the school children of today have reached their majority, will find the Church lined up alone, or almost alone, against the emissaries of Satan. In Europe, the handwriting on the wall has long been evident. The outcome there is still in the balance. But among us, will that younger generation on whom the victory must rest, if there is to be a victory, will they be ready for the struggle? How are we preparing them for a united Christian front? We realize that Hitler and Stalin and their followers everywhere are showing a satanic foresight in turning their most powerful propaganda upon youth.' "

A silence followed as Harriet ceased reading. Then Genevieve took up the thought. "It's easy to see that public high-school students have no chance to learn anything about the Church's social program. And they have no helps to aid them in distinguishing the true from the false leaders. Why, didn't the Bishop say that even within the classroom children of fourteen or fifteen, in the earliest years of high school, are exposed to subtle arguments for materialism, for unbridled license, for divorce, and even for birth control!"

"Yes," agreed Harriet; "he says it is during their high-school days that many are most strongly tempted to unbelief and to utter lawlessness. But above all he stressed the coming conflict. Listen to these words, for instance:

"Our nearly twenty-one million Catholics should indeed be a rampart against the forces that threaten our land. But if in their formative years, when minds are most deeply impressed by ideals and ideologies, more than two-thirds of our younger generation are being exposed daily to the growing influence of the insidious enemy, can we seriously believe that we are making adequate preparation for the zero hour? No! Our Catholic population should be reckoned, not by the number of those whose claim to be counted rests solely on the fact of their Baptism, but rather by the number of those whose Faith has taken root and grown with their years and their experience.' "

"What a forward-looking Bishop! God keep him!" ejaculated Miriam.

"He is a man of vision," fervently assented Genevieve. "But I'm still wondering how his plan can ever work. The six Religious Orders who have already volunteered will head the major departments of the first new high school next Fall. They will use some seculars too. But please tell me how they will all work together."

"Exactly! The spirit differs so from one order to another," urged Harriet.

"Not nearly so much," averred Miriam, "as the spirit of the individual teachers in any public school! And they manage. Religious teachers have one great common cause, the glory of God and the good of the Church. Leave something to Providence—and the Bishop! But I'm curious about the financial end. The building, for example?"

"There's your clear case of Providence," replied Alice triumphantly. "The Board of Education is going to lease him that big grade school, the Sylvester, the one you remember that was nearly emptied by the building of two new parochial schools in the neighborhood."

"As to the second new high school," volunteered Harriet, "eight more Religious Orders will be ready to staff it, by a year from September."

Genevieve added further details. "The students who can will pay a very modest tuition rate, with no extras, and the rental of books included. With the scholarships which the Bishop hopes to have donated, the teachers' salaries will be provided altogether from the tuition fund. The diocese will provide the buildings and their upkeep."

"When these four extra schools are at last functioning, surely our diocese will be unique," was Miriam's comment; "for it will be educating one-hundred per cent of its Catholic high school students."

"Far from it, Miriam," corrected Harriet. "But then, God willing, the Bishop will undertake further plans to shepherd the remaining fifty per cent who will still be in the public high schools. But come! It's time we were at work on our press report. The dailies ought to give us plenty of space for this news, oughtn't they?"

WITH SCRIP AND STAFF

CONGREGATIONAL VESPERS

IN the movement for the restoration of the liturgy, Vespers play an important part. True, it is a service of prayer and praise, not of sacramental action nor of Eucharistic sacrifice. In the Catholic concept, Vespers is not a counterpart to the Holy Mass as is Evensong to Morning Service in some Protestant order of devotions. Vespers are simply a part of the Divine Office, chanted in full through seven periods of the day by the monastic Orders. Most solemnly celebrated of the monastic Hours, it falls at an hour when the sun is sinking and the evening rest approaching. It honors in special manner Our Lady, the Mother of God, through the chanting of her great Canticle, the Magnificat, during which the altar is incensed. Every verse of the canticle is given a special intonation, in order to emphasize this great honor. At the close of Vespers her antiphon is sung, changing according to the season of the year followed by a special prayer for her intercession and protection.

The passing of Vespers from our Catholic life in the United States, save in a minority of privileged localities and parishes, is due in part to the inroads of the automobile and the motion picture. Devotional rivalries are blamed, with various shades of rightness. But the principal difficulty appears to be that people do not understand and appreciate the Vespers as they should.

If the words are meaningless and the chant displeasing to an ear attuned to a very different sort of music, you will naturally feel little joy in attending Vespers. It becomes simply another service; that has high approval, of course, but no significance for your mind or satisfaction for your religious emotions.

If you understand the Latin words, which is easy enough if you use an authorized translation; if you inform yourself as to the meaning of the ceremonies; if you catch the beauty of the chant with its age-old rhythm and subtle tonal system—rhythm and tones that echo the songs of Solomon's Temple, that have resounded through nearly two thousand years of Christianity—Vespers will appear to you in a different light; and you will doubtless learn to love them. But I do not think that this appreciation of the form and content of Vespers, or any other part of the liturgy, is sufficient to establish them as a vital part in our Catholic life, unless it rests upon a much more solid foundation, the understanding of the action itself, of *why* we sing Vespers, why nothing else can quite take its place. There are so many other things instructive and ancient and spiritually pleasing that Vespers, which do impose certain solid inconveniences upon our pleasantly planned Sundays, are fairly sure to lose out in the contest for favor.

The reason for singing Vespers, is that thereby the people share in the priestly action of Christ. As the great High Priest, Christ our Saviour offered during His visible life on earth prayer and sacrifice—of praise, thanksgiving, propitiation and petition; and He offers the same forever mystically in His Church. The privilege of the earthly priest, conferred on him through the Sacrament of Holy Orders, is to share in this priestly action of Christ as far as it is possible for mere man to share in a God-Man's action.

The priest exerts this privilege in a special and uniquely characteristic manner when he offers the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, administers the Sacraments, or celebrates the Divine Office of the Church. The layman, who shares to a partial extent in this privilege, through the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, in like manner exerts his priestly privilege most specifically and characteristically when he participates in the Sacrifice offered by the priest, or shares in the celebration of the Divine Office.

So it is that when the laity take part in the singing of Vespers, they are exerting one function of the priestly character that they enjoy through their membership in the Church. They are not making themselves thereby something other than what they are. They are, on the contrary, doing in all its fulness and dignity *that which they are*.

Certainly the higher is my office, the more I should naturally wish to perform those things that belong specifically and primarily to my office; not all the time, not perhaps most of the time, for life would then not become liveable; but certainly part of the time, and a good part of the time at that.

If I were a King, I should sometimes wish to do royal things, those things which only a King can do, and which belong to kingship by essential right. And the same when one is a physician, or a legislator, or a soldier, or—as we have already seen—a priest. And if you were a Pope, you would wish certainly to celebrate a Papal Mass, do some canonizations and perhaps utter a definition or two.

Far more fitting, far more profitable, will be this kingly and priestly action of the laity if they know its meaning in detail, and have studied chant, words and ceremonies. But the reason for the action is the dignity of the action itself, as an expression of that dignity which is inherent in our Christian state. Were that more fully realized, I believe, we should see a much greater eagerness on the part of the Catholic people to take active part in the singing of Vespers. The antiphonal chant of the Church, the brevity and relative simplicity of the service, similar to Compline, offers an easy opportunity for such participation, which the four congregational Vesper services announced in last week's AMERICA are planned to provide.

JOHN LAFARGE

COMMUNISTS IN THE UNIONS

IT is an error to spy a Communist lurking under every bush. Usually, however, it is a harmless error, akin to that of the man who beholds a lethal disposition in every cat. Perhaps he has a reason for not liking cats, but until he begins to slay every cat he sees, regardless of its previous condition of innocence or crime, we do not call in the alienist.

But it is an error, and a graver error, to refuse to see Communists where they are actually at work. Homer Martin assumed this blindness last year, and today he is forced to fight them for control of the unions of automobile workers. He now accuses them, and he has the evidence for his charges, of fomenting unauthorized strikes, of violating union contracts, of using union funds for improper propaganda, and, almost in words used in this Review a year ago, of making harmonious action within the unions impossible. Mr. Martin does not propose to remedy these evils by expelling all Communists from the U.A.W. As long as they behave themselves they can remain in the union, but they will be barred from holding any office in it, and from attending conventions as delegates.

Because we believe that the U.A.W. can help the automobile worker better than any other type of union, we hope that Mr. Martin will be able to initiate this policy and stick to it. Perhaps he would have done better had he begun a campaign for the adoption of the policy long followed by the United Mine Workers, and recently re-affirmed by that body. The U.M.W. will not admit Communists, and expels any miner who joins the Communist party. The U.M.W. is a militant organization, but it has generally maintained peaceful relations with employers, and has the record of never having broken a contract.

It is as clear as noon-day that no labor organization which relies upon contract-breaking and other forms of violence can serve the wage-earner. That type of union not only alienates public opinion, but not uncommonly ends with the leaders in jail, and the misguided members looking in vain for jobs. "What have we to gain by linking our destinies with Soviet Russia?" asks Mr. Martin. "I would hate to risk my 'collective security' with the firing squads of Stalin."

Labor unions are devised to meet real conditions; hence union organizers must be practical men, not dreamy theorists, easy victims of the agitator who comes forward with plans imported from Moscow. It is not their business to pursue the Communist with grand-jury indictments when he has violated the law, but to keep him out of the union. Political opinions should bar no worker from membership, unless it is clear that these opinions are incompatible with American principles and usages.

Mr. Martin will discover, we fear, that his tempered policy of allowing Communists to join the U.A.W., while debarring them from office, is a compromise that will not work. Mr. Martin should know from experience that half a dozen high-private Communists can wreck any union.

DICTATORS

YOUR dictator invariably creates an imposing array of boards and committees, yet a dictator is incapable of working with any board or any man. Therefore he takes care that every member of these committees shall be a cipher. Witness Napoleon, with his Senate incapable of any act, except to register arbitrary decrees; Hitler and Mussolini who have set up elaborate machinery which they alone control; and Stalin, who graciously authorizes an impotent parliament. Napoleon once wrote that all men are controlled by ribbons and similar gewgaws. Are we Americans an exception?

A FORGOTTEN

HOW far we have fallen from once cherished American ideals is strikingly illustrated in an address given some weeks ago by one of the high officials in the Federal Government. Referring to criticism directed by newspapers against several measures proposed by the Administration, this gentleman remarked: "Yet our democratic government has not even lifted its finger to temper the ardor of a press that is largely critical."

One might retort that this democratic government has not lifted a finger, because such finger-lifting is forbidden by the Constitution. But the reply, while accurate, is not appropriate. What is astonishing in this official's remark is its underlying feeling that if the Government lacks the authority to suppress any newspaper which criticizes the policy of the Administration, it should be given that authority.

In this matter of a free press, we have no fanatical views. We prefer to stress the responsibility of the press, rather than its rights. But it cannot be responsible unless it is free, and free by constitutional warrant.

The incident would be astonishing were it not that we have grown accustomed to similar statements by petty officials swollen with power, accredited and usurped. Astonishing or not, it is useful in indicating the flourishing in high places of principles alien to our form of government. These principles spring from the belief, sincerely held, it may be assumed, that to establish a public good the restrictions of the Constitution may be quietly set aside. Against this

BIGOTRY

BIGOTRY assumes many contemptible forms, but perhaps the lowest form forbids Catholic school children to use public busses. The first link binding Church and State in an unlawful union will be forged, the bigots claim, when children are conveyed at public expense to schools in which they learn about God as well as about geography. Still, if these children may not use the public conveyance, on the ground that it is public property, they should not, logically, be permitted to walk to school on public roads and sidewalks, for these also are public property. Perhaps that ban may yet come.

GOTTEN ADDRESS

belief the great American whose birthday we celebrate next Tuesday has warned us:

Towards the preservation of your government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation on its principles, *however specious the pretexts*. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown.

And again, treating of the right of the people to amend the Constitution, should it in any point appear to be defective, Washington wrote:

But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance, in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit, which the use can at any time yield.

Today Washington's *Farewell Address* is largely a forgotten address. Public officials adopt without protest a philosophy at variance with it, and we the people, whose servants they are, suffer them "to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown."

As Washington's great compatriot, Franklin, said at the closing of the Constitutional Convention, this Government, if well administered, will be a blessing, but if not, "can only end in Despotism."

In our heedlessness, are we tending to that end?

MR. MADDEN REPLIES

EVENTS of the last ten days make highly improbable any immediate investigation by the Senate of the National Labor Relations Board. In his testimony before a Senate sub-committee, Chairman Madden, of the Board, emphatically denied the charges made in specific cases by Senator Burke, and the Senator did not elect to push them closely. Hence the sub-committee will probably be obliged to report that no matters calling for investigation were brought before it.

We regret this decision for many reasons, but chiefly because we believe that it will intensify the dissatisfaction, already widespread, with the Wagner Act, and deepen misunderstandings of the purpose of the Board. The real issues at stake, collective bargaining and the right of workers to organize, are too important to be thus left open to attacks. The country should know just what the Board is supposed to do and what it cannot do.

A very common misapprehension is that the Board is primarily an arbitrating agency to which wage-earners and employers alike may refer differences. Of course, it is nothing of the sort. The Board is empowered to protect collective bargaining and the right to organize, not by arbitrating with employers but by punishing them, when they prevent employees from exercising these rights. Its decisions are enforceable, not directly by the Board, it is true, but through the United States Court of Appeals.

While punishment or the threat of punishment may in some sense be said to be a measure for creating industrial peace, the process very probably leaves the peccant employer in no peaceful frame of mind. He will argue that he has been unjustly treated, since while an employee may appeal to the Board, he may not. In his view, the Board is nothing but a labor-controlled jury which is anxious to send him to jail.

We have no mind to undertake his defense. Chairman Madden is probably correct in saying that many of the charges against the Board arise from the unwillingness of some employers to admit collective bargaining.

On the other hand, we fail to see what either organized labor or the Board itself would lose, were the Wagner Act amended to permit employers to appeal to the Board. Situations can arise—and have arisen—under which the workers are not obliged to appeal to the Board, and the employer is forbidden to appeal. An example in point is the miserable automobile strike a year ago when, in a case certainly affecting inter-State commerce, the Board was helpless. Certainly this restricted legal set-up is not calculated "to diminish the causes of labor disputes." As long as the employer can find a reason to look on the Board as simply a penal body, he will not think of it in terms of peace.

The small business man agrees with his capitalistic brother in thinking that the Wagner Act should be amended. That now famous convention asked that the Board be investigated with a view to

necessary changes both in its personnel and its functions. Beyond this, it was the opinion of the committee that legislation should be adopted, probably through amendment to the Wagner Act, "holding employe and employer alike responsible for the faithful observance of mutual labor agreements."

It seems to us that the opinion of these business men is shared by an increasingly large number of citizens who believe that organized labor will be benefited and industrial peace promoted, by allowing the employer to appeal to the Board. The matter will certainly come before Congress later in the session, but we believe that much time was lost when the plan to investigate the Board was laid aside.

FEDERAL MEDICINE

IN the issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* for January 8, we find a column with the caption, "Does Federal Subsidy Mean Federal Control?" Although we know the opinion of the *Journal*, we venture to answer the question of our own experience.

Whatever the Government subsidizes, the Government controls, lock, stock and barrel, and that for several reasons. First, Congress may not appropriate for purposes the control of which is not vested in one or other of the branches of the Federal Government. In the next place, no government, our own included, is ever at pains to restrict the sphere of its control. The tendency is invariably to enlarge that sphere. When Washington agrees to contribute to the construction of a road, or a canal, or a bridge, the road, canal and bridge are built as Washington orders—or there will be no contribution.

Let our hospitals be subsidized, and our physicians fall in with this plan for "Federalized medicine," and the control of the profession will be shifted sooner or later to a political majority in Congress. A subsidy necessarily spells control.

But our medical brethren should not make the mistake of thinking that this Federal scheme is not popular. Its popularity is growing daily, for the public is beginning to believe that an ancient and noble profession is harboring too many racketeers. True, we meet occasionally the physician who keeps both eyes on his fee, and can spare only an occasional glance for his patient, but he is the exception, not the rule. Nor is the average hospital built to make money. In the Catholic hospitals in but two Boroughs of New York, Manhattan and the Bronx, in 1936 the expenses ran ahead of the receipts by nearly \$1,500,000.

No, our hospitals and physicians are not controlled by racketeers. But it is certainly true that falling ill is an expensive business these days. If we cannot devise some practicable scheme for health insurance, either under private auspices or, if necessary, in cooperation with the States, we may as well get ready for Federal medicine, and turn our sick over to the political racketeers it will create and protect.

THE SOWER

THE parable in tomorrow's Gospel (Saint Luke, viii, 4-15) was spoken early in the second year of Our Lord's ministry, a time when He was followed with enthusiasm by great crowds. In recording it, the three Synoptists refer to the multitudes, while Saint Matthew and Saint Mark add the detail that the press of the crowds obliged Our Lord to take refuge in a boat, from which He spoke to the people. The scene was probably near Capharnaum.

The parable of the sower is one of the very few which Our Lord Himself explained. Hence to that explanation, no word can be added. What we shall find most profitable in the story is to make its teaching the basis of an examination of conscience.

Some of the seed, the Word of God, or any genuine message from God, fell by the wayside. Are our hearts that wayside?

We cannot say that, for the devil has not taken the word from them. We believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ, in all that He has revealed, in all that the Church proposes for our belief.

But other seed fell on stony ground, and the thin soil seemed to allow it to take root. It sprang up quickly, but when temptation came, withered as quickly, for it was not rooted in a soil that could nourish it. Are we that thin soil? Certainly it often happens that God sends us a message in some inspiration of Divine Grace, bidding us avoid a sin to which we are inclined, or to practise a virtue which we much need. We listen, the seed seems to take root, but the results are not very notable. Can it be said of us, in Our Lord's words: "They believe for a while, and in time of temptation they fall away"?

Perhaps this part of the parable describes us with fair accuracy. "In time of temptation," says Our Lord. We are apt to think that "temptation" means some inner impulse to commit murder or some other great crime, forgetting that it also means any kind of trial or testing, such as tribulation and persecution, a great financial loss, the death of someone dear. Has our puny virtue withered under one of these trials?

Again, some seed fell among thorns, and almost as soon as it began to spring up, was choked. This thorny soil is the soul of a man who has allowed himself to become oppressed "with the cares and riches and pleasures of this life." Do the words describe us? "Riches" does not necessarily mean great wealth. It includes anything that we love more than God and the duties we owe Him. "Pleasure" does not mean a long life of luxury. It may last only a day, only a moment. Many a man has sold his soul for a cap and bells, for a fleeting hour of illicit self-seeking.

Finally, some seed fell on good ground. That ground, Our Lord explains, is "a good and perfect heart," not necessarily the heart of a saint, but the heart of one who is trying to become a saint. "Trying to become a saint?" Yes, for everyone who believes in God and His Christ, and honestly strives to conform his life to his Faith, is trying to be a saint. Are we trying?

CHRONICLE

THE CONGRESS. On a record vote the Senate refused to shelve the Anti-Lynching Bill. Opponents again took up the filibuster against it. It will soon be shelved on a non-record vote, insiders said. . . . Bills to subsidize art were before the House. One would set up a Federal Department of Science, Art and Literature with three under-secretaries. . . . Hearings on the Equal Rights for Women Amendment continued. . . . Senator Copeland of the Senate Commerce Committee said Australian-born Harry Bridges was a "menace to our welfare and should be deported." His committee found much evidence of Communist leadership in maritime unions. John L. Lewis placed Bridges in charge of the West Coast C.I.O. Joseph P. Ryan, A.F. of L. leader, charged Bridges with being a Communist. . . . Captain Royal E. Ingersoll, United States Navy, journeyed to London, consulted with British Navy chiefs. Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Naval Operations of the United States Navy, testifying before the House Naval Affairs Committee, refused to tell what Ingersoll and the British naval lords were discussing. "I will not answer that question here," he said, "but I will make a statement in executive session, of course, on the basis that it is absolutely secret, because it is of vital importance to the interests and defense of the United States." Leahy's refusal to answer provoked widespread speculation. Resuming the stand later, Admiral Leahy declared the Navy has no "understandings regarding assistance to be given or received." . . . His statement failed to give much assurance. Senator Johnson introduced a resolution asking what understanding existed with Great Britain. Secretary Hull denied there was any understanding. . . . Admiral Leahy declared the Navy could not defend both coasts, only one at a time. . . . J. Warren Madden, National Labor Relations Board, defended the Board against Senator Burke's charges. . . . The new Farm Bill came out of conference. The House put a gag on debate, allowed only four hours to discuss one of the most complicated bills ever presented. By it the Government acquires unprecedented power to regulate farmers and farm production.

- - -

AT HOME. New York's Manhattan Borough President Stanley M. Isaacs continued Simon W. Gerson, Communist, in public office, despite a growing storm of protest. Mr. Isaacs appointed Gerson. Mayor LaGuardia refused to do anything about it. An attempt to have Governor Lehman remove both Isaacs and Gerson was contemplated. . . . Bolshevik Ambassador Troyanovsky, speaking at the University of North Carolina, urged an alliance between Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. . . . William Z. Foster, Communist chief in the United States, returned from visits to

France and Russia. From his interview, it was evident a recent Communist convention in Arles, France, worked out plans to deceive Catholic workers into cooperating with the Reds. . . . 100,000 workers and unemployed massed in the center of Detroit, protested auto lay-offs, inadequate relief. The A.F. of L. expelled the United Mine Workers of America, the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, the Federation of Flat Glass Workers. . . . When a speaker before the United Mine Workers Convention boomed John L. Lewis for the White House, delegates leaped to their feet, applauded. . . . Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers Union, declared elimination of Communist leadership and influence in labor unions was imperative. He would admit Reds to membership, but not to positions of authority. Communists in his union were spreading propaganda to involve the United States in war with Japan to protect Russia. "There is far too little being said about the influence of Stalinism and Stalinist propaganda in America," he declared.

- - -

WASHINGTON. William A. Klinger, president of the Associated General Contractors of America, declared the WPA chiefs were trying to take the construction field away from private industry. "Socialization of the construction industry is in actual progress," he said. . . . "If American leaders, as represented by the Federal Government, would light some place and maintain a constant perch, rather than flit about like a canary, American business would find encouragement," cried the "little" business men visiting Washington. The conference of the "little" business men was a great disappointment to the Administration. In arranging the conference, it felt the "little" men were behind Administration policies, but discovered the "little" business men very much opposed. . . . Of the sixty United States Senators and Representatives who sent a message of greeting to the Loyalist Government in Spain, three Senators retracted their signatures; twelve Senators said they did not intend to favor the Red Government. Eighteen Representatives more or less backed water. The following are the ones who boldly admitted they intended to express sympathy with the Loyalist Cortes in Spain: Senators: La Follette, Wis., Frazier, N. Dak., Thomas, Utah, Nye, N. Dakota, Ellender, La.; Representatives: Pierce, Ore., Poage, Tex., Lea, Calif., Bernard, Minn., Tiegan, Minn., Gehrmann, Wis., Binderup, Nebr., Boileau, Wis., O'Connell, Mont., Amlie, Wis., Coffee, Wash., Burdick, N. Dak.

- - -

THE ADMINISTRATION. The New Housing Bill became law as the President affixed his signature.

Provision is made for \$2,000,000,000 insurance on housing mortgages; the President may lift this maximum to \$3,000,000,000 if the demand becomes that great. The measure enables a greater number of people to finance housing construction than did the old Act. . . . In the London Naval Conference of 1935-36 Japan asked for naval equality in principle with Great Britain and the United States. Both nations declined; Japan walked out. Britain, France and the United States then signed the 1936 London Naval Treaty, putting no limit on the number of warships but placing restrictions on types of ship. The limit on capital-ship guns for the London signatories rose to 16-inch when Japan declined to accept a limit of 14-inch guns. Rumors have been rife that Japan is building ships and guns larger than those allowed the London treaty signatories. To find out for certain, the United States, in a note practically identical with the notes of Britain and France, asked Tokyo to reveal by February 20 whether these reports are true. If no reply is at hand February 20, the United States, in consultation with other signatories, will resume freedom of action. If an answer is received admitting the truth of the reports, the United States is willing to discuss the question of tonnage and gun calibers to be used in the future if Japan will agree to some limitation. . . . Mayors of Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis visited the President, asked for more WPA money in "the face of a period of industrial unemployment which threatens to approach the dark days of 1931-1932."

CHINA-JAPAN. General Matsui, Japanese Commander at Nanking, ordered his subordinates to tighten discipline, put an end to reports of Japanese misbehavior. . . . Dr. Wang Ching-wei, chairman of Kuomintang Central Political Council, said the Kuomintang (Chinese National party) and the Communists could not work together if the Communists refused to abandon the policy of class struggle. . . . 400,000 Chinese troops defended the Lung-Hai Railway in North China. Japanese columns were striving to stage a drive on the western flank of the Chinese. The eventual Japanese goal in this maneuver is Suchow. . . . Sanguinary fighting continued at Wuhu, on the Yangtze River, sixty miles up from Nanking, and also on the Chekiang Province coast, around Hangchow. . . . The Shansi-Hopeh border areas resounded with guerrilla warfare. Small, scattered Chinese forces stabbed at the Japanese lines of communication.

SPAIN. In a surprise offensive, Nationalist troops under General Fidel Davila pushed the Loyalist army north of Teruel backward along a twenty-five mile front, captured 250 square miles of territory, in which lie the Palomera Mountain range, the towns of Alfambra, Perales, thirty-five other towns and villages. Danger to the Teruel-Saragossa road was eliminated. It was estimated the Leftist army lost 15,000 men in casualties, captures, desertions. 2,000 Leftist dead were counted in the first two

days of the three-day offensive. Prisoners taken by the Nationalists revealed that the top commanding officers of the Leftist army were Russians. The roads were full of Loyalist militiamen, their officers carrying white flags to surrender. . . . Catholics caught in Red territory cannot hear Mass. Permission has been granted for a radio Mass to be broadcast on Sundays from Franco territory, enabling Catholics living under the "Spanish democracy" to have Mass.

GERMANY. Chancellor Hitler, in a "bloodless purge," shook up the cabinet, the high army command. He assumed "personal and direct command over all the armed forces." War Minister Marshal Werner von Blomberg, Colonel General Werner von Fritsch, Commander-in-Chief of the army, were permitted to retire because of "ill health." General Wilhelm Keitel became Hitler's personal chief of staff and took over the War Ministry; Colonel General Walther von Brauchitsch became Commander-in-Chief of the army. Besides Blomberg and Von Fritsch, seven other army and six air generals were retired. Twenty-two generals were placed in new commands. . . . Joachim von Ribbentrop, ardent Nazi, became Foreign Minister. . . . A new Privy Cabinet Council was established. Baron von Neurath, former Foreign Minister, was made president of this Council, thus retaining his seat in the Hitler Cabinet. . . . Colonel General Goering was created Field Marshal, consolation for his failure to obtain the War Ministry. . . . German ambassadors to Vienna, Rome and Tokyo were recalled. . . . Whether the shake-up represented a Nazi party or an army victory was still in doubt. All the new generals are old-line, Potsdam-code army men. . . . The Ministry of Economics was completely reorganized: Walther Funk was inducted as Minister. . . . The Rev. Martin Niemöller, Protestant pastor, went on trial under the Hitler anti-Christian campaign. The trial will be secret. . . . Eight Catholic Bavarian Bishops protested the secret police's suppression of Catholic Youth societies.

FOOTNOTES. A new London bureau for improving and increasing British propaganda was set up by the Government. . . . After granting permission for an American Embassy representative to interview the imprisoned American citizen, Mrs. Rubens, the Russian Government insisted the conversation must be held in Russian, which the diplomat did not know. Then the Bolsheviks postponed the interview once more. . . . Soviet daily production norms in steel, iron, coal, motor trucks, freight-car loadings dropped considerably. . . . Italy agreed to cooperate with the new French and British anti-piracy measures in the Mediterranean, following the sinking of two British merchantmen. . . . Virginio Gayda, editor of *Giornale d'Italia*, believed to have access to official information, gave in detail the enormous amount of aid France is constantly giving to the Spanish Reds by way of planes and munitions.

CORRESPONDENCE

FREE ASSEMBLY

EDITOR: I write to express my deep appreciation of the editorial, *Red Baiting* (AMERICA, January 29).

Catholics should realize that Constitutional protection for ordered liberty is not relative, but absolute. The Bill of Rights, and the First and Fourteenth Amendments protect us, not precisely as Catholics, but as American citizens. The C.I.O. is not an illegal or subversive organization *per se*. If any of its agents as organizers violate just laws, incite to riot or preach sedition, there are legal Constitutional means of curbing them. I hope that the C.I.O. will purge itself of Communistic elements which discredit a movement in itself licit and even laudable. But no President or Governor or Mayor has the right under our Constitution to ban the C.I.O. unless it violates the law.

Let militant Catholic Actionists when the flag is waved ask, "What flag?" The answer is clear: "The glorious symbol of freedom." As long as it means this, it is the flag we all revere. When it symbolizes mere arbitrary power, let us change to another banner.

The Supreme Court with unanimous voice has upheld the right of free speech, free assembly and a free press, subject to certain necessary limitations for the common weal. Justices Hughes, Roberts, Cardozo, Brandeis, Stone and McReynolds concur in this. I refer especially to the decision in the De Jonge case in January, 1937. I prefer the voice of the Court to that of any mayor from Jersey City to Seattle. In protecting minorities they protect Catholic minorities. They protect true Americanism.

Woodstock, Md. LAURENCE K. PATTERSON, S.J.

VACATION MISSIONERS

EDITOR: At a time when so many are driving South, I direct attention to the struggling condition of the Church in so many places from Virginia to Florida.

What a lot of good could be done by motorists if in passing through the many towns and cities of the South they would ask to be directed to the local Catholic Church. And in how many places are the Northern visitors going to be surprised when the natives look at them in astonishment! Many of whom the question is asked are going to be surprised that intelligent folks would even consider such a question. The visitor is in many instances going to be shocked at some of the absurd replies.

The traveler through some of the Southern sections is going to be taken aback when he finds that the priest gets to certain towns perhaps once a

month. If only our Catholic travelers in passing every little mission church along the way would stop for a few minutes to give a few words of encouragement to the poor missionary, what a work would soon spread! The non-Catholic neighbor is going to feel a greater respect for the Church when he notes the interest being shown by the better class of traveler.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

ANNA A. EGAN

PROTESTANT BELIEF

EDITOR: Father McGarry's article, *Evolution, Not Genesis, Is the Myth for Moderns* (January 29), clearly shows the solid foundation on which Catholic doctrine is built and the shifting sands which form the basis of Protestant belief. Hearty congratulations to Father McGarry for a vigorous and truly Catholic stand!

A partial printing in AMERICA of the 242-page report, *Doctrine in the Church of England*, issued by the Commission headed by the Archbishop of York, would help to remove any doubt as to the uncertainty which permeates Protestant belief. Christianity would be in precarious hands were the Church of England its sole champion. The Commission's reports should make Catholics thank God that they have a guide in the See of Peter whose word leaves no room for doubt.

Saint Mary's, Kans.

CARMINE BENANTI

INSIDE THE CUP

EDITOR: Let me applaud your editorial, *The Catholic Who Lapses* (January 29). The trouble in many of our schools and colleges seems to be, fundamentally, the conviction that anyone can teach Religion. Since I left school, I have argued more or less boisterously with many non-Catholics—atheists, agnostics, Protestants—and I know that if I had depended on my courses in religion, I could never have gotten to first base. As it was, I often came close to being tagged out at home plate. I thank God for men like G. K. Chesterton.

My point is that I think my case is typical. The most casual observation gives me reason to think so. Catholic colleges are turning out thousands with little more than a superficial knowledge of Christianity. How can they be expected to resist the onslaught of arguments and questions from a God-forsaking world?

Therein lies another point. Your editorial deplores the fact that some of these fall away from the Church. I would rather deplore the fact that they keep up an outward connection with the Church. The Catholic who has made millions by

paying starvation wages, the corrupt Catholic politician, the Catholic editor of an obscene magazine, the Catholic gangster—better for the Church that they had severed their connection with it entirely! I suspect that one of the main reasons why the United States is not a Catholic country is that there are too many "Catholics" of this kind in it.

Address Withheld

C. M.

JUNNIE AND THE MATER

EDITOR: I'm afraid Frank Knoll (AMERICA, January 29) has stirred up an irritating problem for parents who practice what they preach and refrain from mixing high-balls for both themselves and youth under twenty-one. We shall once again be taken to task by the young people's division of the C.I.O. (Can't In Our House), advancing upon us waving page 402 of AMERICA in our faces and demanding with heroic persistence: "If Frankie can, why can't we?" And when we reply with confident exteriors and quivering innards: "Well, you see, Junnie, we think it is better to play safe than be sorry," we will be conscious that the only reaction in Junnie's mind is concerned with the advancing fossilism of the Mater!

But seriously, I think there is much to be said in favor of such fossilism. Liquor is dynamite and frequently a single match ignites the fuse. There must be constant care to guard against explosion. Frank Knoll and many more like him are absolutely capable of self-restraint; but how about the lad that has had the one drink for conviviality in his own home, then goes to call for his pal at whose table another one drink is being consumed?

The parent who serves no strong liquor to young people will never have to suffer the agony of personal culpability when tragedies of drunkenness are prone upon his doorstep.

Flushing, N. Y.

MARIE DUFF

LABOR ATTITUDE

EDITOR: I wish it were possible for me to subscribe to Father Blakely's attitude on the unionized labor situation of the country, but I cannot. As a matter of fact I consider Father Blakely a very unfair partisan when it comes to any question dealing with union labor. He has consistently upheld the policies of John L. Lewis in his efforts to rivet one of the worst unionized labor rackets up the back of the nation that has ever been proposed. If John L. Lewis and his C.I.O. are not thorough-going Communists, then is there no Communism either in this country nor in any other part of the world.

One of Father Blakely's defenses for the C.I.O. is that this union is attempting to secure all the benefits for the laborers in the lower salary brackets that the A.F. of L. have succeeded in winning for the more skilled workers. As I have pointed out before, the success of any unionized labor movement where the objects are to secure higher wages,

shorter working hours, and all the other benefits that are supposed to accrue to the members of these organizations is absolutely dependent upon the possibility of saddling the costs upon a much more numerous body of non-unionized workers; for it should be evident to all honest observers that all labor unions are out to rook the public only for their own benefit. Just as soon as all laborers become unionized, then their scheme for raising wages, etc., must fall to ground from its own weight, because then there remains only the income of the proprietor to confiscate, and this usually amounts to but little.

Father Blakely also seems to have a peculiar antipathy against Henry Ford. He speaks of Lewis "as now planning to take Henry Ford and a dozen small barons into camp." I say, "All success to Henry Ford!" He is the one outstanding American who has had the guts to stand up and fight the lunacies of the New Deal. It seems to me Catholics in particular have little reason to fight with Henry. Some years ago he undertook to expose the forces that are responsible for all the present world unrest. He caused to be published a good part of the famous *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*, wherein it was shown that the two arch-enemies of the Catholic Church, viz: Freemasonry and Jewry, were really at the bottom of all the trouble. For his pains Mr. Ford was violently attacked in the courts; one complainant got a judgment against him, and Henry had to go out of the publishing business. When it comes to defending the Supreme Court, Father Blakely has no equal, but his standing on labor questions, in my opinion, leaves something to be desired.

Michoacan, Mexico

ROYAL P. JARVIS

VATICAN LIBRARY

EDITOR: The Prefect of the Vatican Library, Msgr. A. M. Alliarado, makes the following request of the United States Catholic Historical Society. He finds, he says, that in the series of the forty-eight volumes of *Catholic Historical Records and Studies* so far published by the Society, the Vatican Library collection lacks these volumes: Numbers III, IV, V, XI, XII, XIV, XV, XVIII, XIX, XX.

He is very anxious to complete the set with these missing volumes, but unfortunately the Society has distributed all its copies of these editions among the members and cannot supply them to the Vatican Library. Most of our members are readers of AMERICA and in the hope that some of them might be willing to give these volumes in answer to the request from Vatican City, this appeal is made to them.

If they are sent to me at 346 Convent Avenue, New York City, the volumes will be shipped to the Vatican and, with each, the librarian of the *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* will be specially notified of the donor's name.

New York, N. Y.

E. P. HERBERMANN,
Executive Secretary

LITERATURE AND ARTS

SHALL WE STAR THE SAINTS?

MAURICE C. FIELDS

A HIGHLY exciting topic, fairly bristling with controversy, was treated by Father Gillis, C.S.P., in the first of his series of radio addresses on the Catholic Hour called *Saints vs. Kings*.

"The dramatists have neglected the Saints," despite there being, Father Gillis declares, "enough raw material of drama to tax the genius of a Shakespeare or a Sophocles" in their lives and legends. He finds, moreover, that playwrights have so deteriorated that they can do nothing more original than spin out more and more insipid variations on the sex-theme.

What a blessing it is to find so sane and penetrating a scoring of the canker i' the bud of our modern *mores*! The present writer is gratified to the point of wanting to shout Father Gillis' wisdom from skyscrapers. For the past ten years I have been a rather frequent playgoer, and how often have I crept out of the theatre clutching at the straw-recollection of handsome settings, gorgeous costumes, and invigorating direction squandered upon tuppenny drivel about sex indiscretion. My own experience as a spectator makes me credit producers who, after abandoning innumerable projects during a season, finally give it up as a bad job and put on a revival of Shakespeare—because, as they perennially wail, there are no good plays being written! Witness *Richard II*, *Julius Caesar* (in modern dress), *Antony and Cleopatra*, *As You Like It*, and more to follow of the present season on Broadway.

True it is, indubitably, that play-going is an amusement, first and foremost, but there are those of us still young enough to enjoy fun in life without wanting to check our brains with the wraps when entering a legitimate theatre. Nevertheless, anything that smacks of moralizing on the stage is frowned upon by the modern majority. We are quite capable, we assuredly presume, of taking care of our own morals, thank you.

Morals are far more important to us than these, it would seem to me; and therefore, why not have trained specialists to aid us with them? I throw this out because I can foresee several practical difficulties in the way of adapting Saints' lives to the

stage. First, I hardly see anyone in so secularized an amusement world as we patronize wishing to sit through a cycle of Miracle plays for the sheer fun of it. We refuse to treat these things seriously. They must be whimsical and provocative of a slightly condescending humour, like *Father Malachy's Miracle*, say. But I do not believe Father Gillis advocates a return to the Miracle-play as the sole medium of dramatic expression. There are not enough Reinhardts to go round. And the Church long since relinquished her prerogative as a patroness of the drama, more's the pity. Although, if *bingo* can enjoy respectable sponsorship, surely the art of dramatic presentation—so beloved of Christ in His teachings of truth through parables—would not injure her prestige one whit. And here may be one of best solutions of this hydra-like problem.

To continue, any attempt on the part of a fairly imaginative playwright to infuse the sparse facts of most of the Saints' lives with vitality, spanning the gaps which Church history often leaves, would bring a deluge of wrath down upon his head. There are too many pious and well-intentioned people who have come to forget that the Saints began life as human beings and lived normal lives in some measure, becoming extraordinary creatures of God only when the Holy Ghost spread an aura about their way. Father Gillis mentions Shaw's *Saint Joan* as a notable example of a playwright being lifted to greater heights by choosing a lofty subject that purified and chastened him.

After seeing *Jeanne d'Arc* magically re-created by Miss Katharine Cornell, I can concur; but when I first read the play I was even more outraged and repelled than I was at the witch-hussy that Shakespeare sets before us in *1 Henry VI*. It was only through Miss Cornell and subsequent readings that I really saw where I had been lacking. *Jeanne* was a peasant girl living in an age of coarseness sheathed in luxury (in both senses). To recreate her as a vivid credible human figure of her time, one must endow her with some of the fringes of the life that composed her environment. Imagine the reactions of such an audience as I sketch to

a Saint's being made to utter even a watered-down *damn* not employed in the Biblical acceptance! It goes almost without saying that we wish here no extremist wallowing in what J. Donald Adams recently referred to as the cult of the four-letter words.

Yes, it is lamentably true for most of us that Saints must be shown as *all good*—snow-white with not even a smudge of a nuance in gradation—or we will have none of them. Then, too, they must always triumph in the most obvious manner, either through miracle or Divine intercession of some sort, over all obstacles. This can be made artistically plausible in the hands of a theatrical genius. Another vulgar error is to insist on great physical beauty in such characters in drama. It can readily be seen this falsification and sentimentalization give a decidedly static quality to the character, and verisimilitude in dramatic conflict is obviated at the outset. The *deus ex machina* motivation would finally reduce the piece to a beautifully null, beautifully void bit of exposition, in which the Saints involved were more acted upon than acting.

The foregoing assumes that such plays will be put on, with no interference from Lords Chamberlain and other censorial dictators. But what of the box-office which plays so huge a part in all our theatrical ventures? It has been the crushing experience of persons who have a shred of moral sense left these days, that most of our contemporaries are flatly uninterested in being uplifted. Too long has the tag "sophistication" served as a tawdry lure beguiling many to root about in what a recent writer terms "perfumed garbage." (How long, oh, how long will the distinguished Lynn Fontanes and Alfred Lunts continue to caper through these tedious glittering sepulchres of sordidness?) How Pope saw through us when he put it:

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien
As, to be hated, needs only to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Her twin-sister Hypocrisy should come in for a like exposé, but we have neither space nor time to diffuse our energies as the matter deserves.

The public wants (and this is a radical cause of the evil) wickedness, in a measure, because of the sense of superiority tinged with envy it experiences in beholding someone more immoral than itself. It is even more cast down with inferiority, on the other hand, before a supremely good character, and it resents being made to feel low. (How bored even the authoress was with her Good Woman in the current play *The Women*, taking the poor thing to her bosom only when she proved as empty and idiotically pathological as the others in the final scenes of the play.) This may be seen as a modern perversion of the Greek idea of *katharsis* in the drama; the Greeks felt this spiritual purgation and uplift when they beheld a good man *fall*. Cannot an even nobler spiritual sublimation be achieved through beholding a good man *rise* to supreme heights of goodness? This is surely the Christian way out of our dramatic doldrums.

Father Gillis would leave the treatment of

Christ's life in dramatic form to the "unsophisticated peasants of Oberammergau," since we have no playwright great enough to attempt it. I heartily agree—but for an added reason. In drama there must be conflict between characters if scenes are to *move*. A weak-kneed sentimentalist taking a stab at a scene like the Temptation of Christ would be betrayed into the same fallacy of depiction which I observe in an early painting hanging in the galleries of the Frick Mansion. Satan grovels at the feet of Our Lord in a state of utter vileness and depravity. It is striking enough contrast on the surface; but how it fails in making us *see* the guile of Satan called Lucifer in assuming alluring guises in order to destroy us. The beholder is not convinced that Christ was for a moment—His Godhead aside for the nonce—taken in by this spot of filth. No, it must rather have been Lucifer in dimming splendor, of outward charm and beauty, who appeared before Christ in order to make him a worthy adversary to the epitome of All-Good.

As most people are aware, both the Old and New Testaments have by no means been entirely neglected by dramatists—nor have the Saints been altogether ignored. Browning's *Saul*, to my mind, might lose in lyric beauty, were it transferred to the stage; the drama is already explicit in the Old Testament. Unfortunately, I have not been favored to see Tennyson's *Becket* performed; but I find the dramatic moments so spotty in the reading that I can see it on the stage only in a stringently cut version. With this slight prejudice, I am unprepared to go all the way with Father Gillis in seeing *Becket* as "of course a larger and more skilful play" than T. S. Eliot's *Murder In The Cathedral*. This latter play reads as swiftly and stirring as it acts, and with no bias against Eliot's Anglo-Catholicism to stand as a barrier, I was caught up by the high poetic and psychological excellence maintained by Mr. Eliot throughout his drama, when I sat through two performances of it at the Manhattan Theatre during its surprisingly long and successful WPA run a year or so ago.

If there still remains a doubter of the feasibility of the suggestion made by Father Gillis' suggestion, let him (and sceptical producers) be reminded of a play by Mr. Marc Connelly entitled *The Green Pastures*, which has already become legendary and is now hinted at for revival. The interpretation of the Biblical legends through a Negro psychology may be considered by some adventitious for our point, but it lent that very quality of intimate *humanity* to the text upon which I elaborated earlier. This matter of interpretation demands talent, skill, sincerity and vision. Heaven forbid that some Grub Street poetaster should rush in where Father Gillis deplores the lack of playwrights of major stature, and ruin all! It would be indeed ideal if this project could be launched under Church guidance, for such a development would conduce to the everlasting glory and honor of God.

Shall we, then, star the Saints?

Yes! But for the love of good theatre, let us give them a decent build-up and a first-rate supporting cast!

BOOKS

ALDOUS HUXLEY VOICES HIS NEW CREED

ENDS AND MEANS. By Aldous Huxley. Harper and Bros. \$3.50

MR. HUXLEY should not have written this kind of a book—at least not yet. He does not like the world we live in and would make it over. At any rate by a discussion of the ends that men aim at, and the means they employ, he suggests how a new brave world may emerge. He is modest about his prospects of success. For very near the end of the book he tells us: "Even a fragmentary outline of a synthesis is better than no synthesis at all."

Now this is the type of statement, and it abounds in the book, which has led the present reviewer to think that Mr. Huxley might better have waited. A synthesis which is fragmentary is a contradiction. It is the type of dictum that a popular novelist might toy with—but with which a philosopher would have nothing to do. Mr. Huxley on his own admission is in the throes of a conversion (if not of a reformation) from what he calls the philosophy of Meaninglessness. He says quite frankly and truly that for him and his contemporaries that habit of finding no meaning in the world was essentially an instrument of liberation.

From this outlook on life, we catch Mr. Huxley on the rebound. He has gone over to the meaningful view and presented it to us in his book. But one wonders whether his first state was not a better one than his latest. The point is that the author has no synthesis, for the reason, primarily, that he has not as yet shaken himself free of the splinters of the world which once exploded in his hands. What he gives us, in consequence, is a thing of shreds and patches: nineteenth-century Naturalism, Stoicism, mainly in its Eastern variety, Pantheism and quite unwittingly, liberalism; all stitched together with that disdain of dialectic which was always so prominent a feature of that Renaissance and Reformation product, found "meaningless" by him and his contemporaries.

He says very truly that society will be changed only when the individuals who compose it are changed. The ideal individual is the one who is "non-attached." "Non-attached to his craving for power and possessions; non-attached to his exclusive loves." And this non-attachment "has always been associated with attachment to an ultimate reality more significant than self." In Mr. Huxley's scheme, then, nothing could be more important than the nature of this ultimate reality. In the last analysis it will be the final motive or, at any rate, the fundamental force by and through which the individual is to change his life and so, that of the whole society in which he lives.

In sum, this means that Mr. Huxley hopes to have this world shriven of its sins and purged of its woes, when each individual forgets that he is a person and becomes merged with a thing about which Mr. Huxley can say little more than that it is impersonal. It is a fluid and vague thing; but it is the cornerstone of whatever synthesis Mr. Huxley hoped to make. From a philosophy in which the individual was everything—was atomic, was unrelated to anything outside himself—the author turns to a view in which the individual is nothing. From the creed that the only law was the expression of his own personality in ways which the individual alone would dictate, to the bizarre view that the individual must try to cast off his person-hood and merge with a non-person called Ultimate Reality, is the journey Mr. Huxley has made. It is exactly the road traversed by

the whole Reformation idea—an idea in which, possibly, Mr. Huxley would not consciously have any part.

There also, one can mark the same course. In the beginning there was a vigorous assertion of the individual, an intolerance of any restraint; in the end, the world we all have known, with its surrender of the individual to something outside himself, his submergence in the economic unit, and in the modern omniscient state; and within the individual himself the strange decline of the very idea of person, when men are content to think in terms of economic security rather than in terms of liberty and human dignity.

It is a bit bewildering not only from the standpoint of dialectic, but from that of experience and common sense. Does not the experience of the last four centuries in the West show Mr. Huxley that our present woes come upon us in direct proportion to the recession of the idea of a personal God? No age has been as secular as our own. Whatever order still exists for the modern is there, because he could not be as this-worldly as he wished. He is still living on the scraps and fragments of a culture he was too indolent or too obtuse wholly to throw away. That culture possessed a genuine synthesis. If Mr. Huxley wants a *Civitas*, it must be the *Civitas Dei*, and the word "God" must be used not as in the pantheistic stoicism of the Eastern sects but in the sense in which it was used to bring light to the dark ages and civilization to the West.

Undoubtedly Mr. Huxley knows of the Thomistic Synthesis. I am sure he does not know it. His book abounds in over-simplifications and lack of distinctions; as when Saint Augustine and Calvin are lumped together as teaching the intrinsic depravity of the human will; or that belief in the other-ness of God entails the view that Grace alone and not works is effective for salvation; or that there is no discernible difference between Simeon, the Stylite, and American pole-sitters.

Mr. Huxley, it appears, has read widely but not too well. We could wish that when he rebounds from the present extreme (as his innate sincerity will undoubtedly cause him to do) he apply his unquestionable talent to a careful search for the thing which is beneath his eyes. But then he will write no synthesis. He will be content perhaps to contemplate a beauty ever ancient and ever new.

GEORGE BULL

PATRIOTIC LEADER RESCUED FROM OBLIVION

OLIVER POLLOCK: THE LIFE AND TIMES OF AN UNKNOWN PATRIOT. By James Alton James. D. Appleton-Century Co. \$4

THIS biography of Oliver Pollock, the Irish-born immigrant who financed the American Revolution in the West, from the pen of professor-emeritus James Alton James of Northwestern University, is supplementary to the same author's biography of George Rogers Clark, which appeared a few years ago. The two volumes, centering the events of the conquest of the Old Northwest around the two outstanding agents in it, Clark on the military, and Pollock on the economic side, present jointly the best documented and most authoritative account of that historic episode now in print. James's familiar thesis, that Clark did conquer the Northwest and that his conquest was the decisive factor in securing that magnificent region for the United States, is urged again in the volume under review.

It is an astonishing thing, in view of the enormous

fund of research and interpretation that has been expended on the theme of the American Revolution, that the story of one of its most efficient promoters should here be told for the first time. The explanation of the phenomenon is apparently to be found in the circumstance that Pollock worked, exclusively, it would appear, behind the scenes. Amid the glamor of military operations and the inevitably recorded tactics of statesmen and diplomats, the quiet, inconspicuous contribution, indubitably vital though it was, made by him to the success of the revolutionary cause became obscured and, in the issue, was entirely forgotten.

It is the merit of James's book that it rescues Pollock from unmerited oblivion and places him on the pedestal where he rightfully belongs. We have Clark's own testimony that without the financial assistance rendered by Pollock, he could not in the first instance have won the Northwest nor subsequently held it for the United States. Moreover, it appears that the Irishman's influence was decisive in securing Spain's entry on the American side and the subsequent opening up of the Mississippi to the revolutionaries for military operations and trade. Galvez, the Spanish governor in Louisiana, was Pollock's friend and the friendship drew him out of the neutrality which otherwise he would have maintained in the contest.

The book rises in all substantial respects to a level with its subject and has values in new and significant content that insure it permanence. Much illuminating background for the incidents rehearsed is set out; in particular, the glimpses given the reader of social and economic life in New Orleans and the Illinois country in colonial days are as accurate as they are vivid. Oliver Pollock, it would appear, was a Catholic though only two data in the present biography associate him with the Catholic Church, the baptism of one of his children in St. Joseph's Church, Willing's Alley, Philadelphia, and his second marriage, the ceremony of which was performed by Bishop John Carroll in Baltimore.

Attention may be called to a few slips. The Jesuits were banished from Louisiana in 1763, not 1767 (p. 14). The Duc de Chartres, after whom Fort Chartres was named, was not a regent of France (p. 22). His father, the Duc d'Orleans, was regent for Louis XV. Cahokia has never been a part of East St. Louis, which lies several miles to the north of it (p. 22). L'Ance à la Grace (p. 322), the original French name of the site of New Madrid in Missouri, should read L'Anse à la Gralsee.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

THE CHOSEN FEW WHO MODERNIZED WORLD

MOULDERS OF DESTINY. RENAISSANCE LIVES AND TIMES.

By Lloyd W. Eshleman. Covici-Fried Inc. \$3

THE Moulders are ten: Valla, Charles VII, Henry VII, Machiavelli, Raphael, Paracelsus, Loyola, Catherine de' Medici, Don John of Austria and Jan Coen the Dutchman. The general idea is that these men made things modern, got rid of medieval nonsense and brought up-to-date thought, France, England, politics, art, medicine, Catholicism, nationalism, imperialism and what-not. On these ten pegs the author hangs all sorts of observations, explanations, innuendos, hypotheses, pontifical pronouncements and plain mistakes.

Joan of Arc is languidly dismissed as a "dupe of men" and the blazing drama of her death is neatly tucked away into four cold words. Mary Queen of Scots, at least as a girl, was just "an empty-headed little flirt"; and, of course, the young Loyola "spent most of his time in gaming, fighting and, doubtlessly, in seducing women."

It would serve no good purpose to point out mere mistakes in a book like this. And yet one could add an enormous foot-note to the opening sentence of the Foreword: "This book is not a scholarly treatise." It is the

tiny mistakes that best tell the tale of the author's historical dilettantism. To take but a single example. On two occasions in the text and again in the index mention is made of the *Collège de Montaigne*. It is not a big mistake; it is merely as though one should say: "Columbia University is not far from Columbia Circle."

Translated into Russian or Spanish (and subjected here and there to official censorship) the book will make a welcome addition to the texts of certain Soviet or Mexican schools. It is written in a style so simple as not to be over the head of the average adolescent even in a Communistic society. Its carefully selected and evenly distributed allusions to moral turpitude will help to rid young minds of puritanical prejudices. The references to sex are particularly abundant; and are, at times, daring, indelicate and (on old-fashioned standards) indecent.

GERALD G. WALSH

BOOKS IN BRIEFER REVIEW

STARFORTH. By Lucille Papin Borden. The Macmillan Co. \$2.50

AN unusual portrait of a beautiful and noble character is drawn by Mrs. Borden in her story of Maris Starforth. As Lady-in-Waiting and friend to Queen Mary Tudor, much of her life was spent amid the glamor and intrigue of the English Court during the troubled times of the so-called Reformation. Consequently, there are many familiar historical scenes and events recorded throughout the book.

Several little green volumes, written by Maris as her personal diary, figure prominently in the narrative. They reveal many secret and intimate details pertaining to royal persons and their claims to the throne, and when the books are stolen by a messenger of the Queen, their author is charged with disloyalty to the Crown and is exiled to the Colonies. Although it is difficult at times for the reader to distinguish between the excerpts from the diary and the story proper, there is for the most part a sustained interest throughout the book and several glimpses behind the scenes not found in the usual accounts of the period.

The author has found Maris true to her high ethical ideals as well as her deep Catholic Faith, when her beauty and attractiveness could so easily have led her to prefer worldly favor and honors in return for a worldly life. But the word compromise was foreign to her character. Amid the violent storms of religious persecution and the turbulent strife of the Court the serenity of Maris' soul shines forth with the tranquil constancy of the Morning Star.

YOUNG MAN OF GREENWICH VILLAGE. By Doris Overland. L. C. Page and Co. \$2

THE plot is a good one: the pursuit of helpless males by feather-headed harpies. It is very clean and right-minded and draws a sound moral for the over-active young ladies of our time. It is gay, too. The author seems to be fond of all her characters and wants us to love them. However, the account that she gives of them is not very convincing. The young males are too innocent and good natured while the harpies are not attractive enough to explain the complications they cause. The conversation of both sexes is flat; no inhibitions about saying the most obvious things in the most hackneyed way. But the author is young and so, perhaps, she will learn another time to boil down her style and to add some spice of precision.

THE PRODIGAL PARENTS. By Sinclair Lewis. Doubleday, Doran. \$2.50

THE best of this newest from the untiring creator of midwest Americans is the distinctness with which its five most important characters are etched. It is doubt-

ful, however, if Fredk. Wm. Cornplow (nearly all the people in the book, as usual with Mr. Lewis, have the queerest names) will measure up to Babbitt, or Dods-worth or Arrowsmith. As a document on an American problem the book is hardly of great consequence. The message is that parents nowadays are being imposed upon by their children, and that it is largely their own fault. Fredk. Wm. tries to do something about it, but mostly by escape. One asks: Will the new generation do any better with their own offspring? Or just something else equally improvident? There are throughout good morsels of mature wisdom, and the cracks at would-be Communists (who do not know what it is all about) are fine. It was fine, too, to read that Fred and Hazel were ever each one and the only one for the other.

ROOT IN THE ROCK. By D. H. Southgate. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. \$2.50

ONE must admire this thoughtful novel of life among the better-class Brahmins. Most writers who deal with this subject resort to nauseating details that horrify and really distract from their purpose. The peculiar gift that the author admirably exemplifies here is the ability to indicate the fundamental abuses without recourse to shocking narratives that offend decency. Details of this nature can readily enough be imagined without descending to obnoxious particulars.

Root in the Rock is a beautiful story told in a style that is charmingly simple and touching. Here are portrayed the great social evils that lie behind life in India, even of the better class, with its child marriages, revolting customs and usages of the Brahmins, cruel subjection of womankind and the incipient movement to free them from the prevailing barbarous practices and fanatical superstition. The author merely gives an appealing life-picture of the Indian caste system. The picture is good and true, and will doubtless do much toward effecting its purpose. It is a thought-provoking novel that should circularize widely.

CAUSALITY AND IMPLICATION. By D. J. B. Hawkins. Sheed and Ward. \$1.50

CONCISELY written, this little book is a closely reasoned analysis of the metaphysical nature of the all-important concept and fact of causality, with special, although not exclusive, reference to the efficient cause. Not an introduction to its subject, it presupposes that the reader is not unacquainted with the history of philosophical thought and is both able and willing to devote a few hours to abstract speculation.

Granted these prerequisites, the essay will be found both enlightening and provocative. The Aristotelian, or entailment theory of causality is expounded and defended against the attacks of Hume and the regularity theory which stems from him. The additional doctrine has been cast in modern terminology, a feature which should prove of interest to philosophers of any school.

Starting with an historical account of causality as understood by Aristotle and Hume, the author sets forth the fundamentals of their opposition, and then makes an analysis of the concept of cause in terms of implication that justifies Aristotle's theory and answers Hume's contra-analysis. He then proceeds to apply his analysis to experience, and thus vindicates its objective validity against Kant's riddle of the *a priori* synthesis. The principles of sufficient reason and causality are next dissected, keenly studied, and established. The principles are called synthetic, in the sense Kant uses the word; this usage would be opposed by Scholastics, who generally regard them as analytic, but the difference, in the present context, seems more verbal than real.

A more serious difficulty is found in the author's treatment of universal teleology, which seems to imply (although the conclusion is not drawn) that the traditional argument for the existence of God from the order of the universe is invalid. The book concludes with a philosophical treatment of scientific induction and hypothesis and an enlightening contrast between philosophic and scientific methodology and certitude.

THEATRE

MISS GORDON'S NORA. I have been rather deliberate in getting around to Ruth Gordon's admirable performance of Nora in Jed Harris' equally admirable production of *A Doll's House* at the Morosco Theatre. For one reason I have seen a dozen Noras, more or less, and I had begun to feel that I could get along without one for a year or two. For another, this is the season when four or five new plays are offered us in a single week. Given the choice between a too-familiar classic and a promising new play, I instinctively hie me to the modern piece—and frequently regret it.

Anything Miss Gordon does is interesting, however, and her Nora is not an interpretation to miss. It is, in very truth, *her* Nora. There is much more of Miss Gordon than of Ibsen in the first ten minutes of the present *Doll House*. After that I forgot every one but Nora until the end of the play, which of course revived my old-time problem as to whether Nora would have deserted those children. That doubt is always with me when the final curtain falls. Sometimes it is strong, sometimes tepid. Its character depends on the quality of the art and the personality which the Nora of the particular moment is showing.

Claire Eames, for example, convinced me that she had forgotten the children altogether, and that she might even fail to remember them later. Mrs. Fiske (I think it was) persuaded me she had simply mislaid the infants for a few moments, during her big scene, and that with a hand still on the knob of that slammed door she would now beat its panels with the other hand in a frantic effort to get back to them. It was always those children and the dramatic—not the human—problem they presented that held me during the great final scenes. Was Ibsen wrong for once? Would any mother, anywhere, leave those children? Miss Gordon is emphatically *not* the maternal type. It was her acting and nothing else which convinced me that she could and would and *did* leave those two youngsters to the calculating mercy of their father.

After the first ten minutes, her whole interpretation of the part was fine, and arrestingly different from the usual pattern in certain scenes. Her Nora really loved Christine; her Nora had not known that Doctor Rank loved her; her Nora had long suspected the weakness of her husband; her Nora knew from the first of what Krugstad was capable. It is a big interpretation and a big performance as a whole. Dennis King is quite surprisingly inside the skin of a type of character entirely new to him, and Paul Lukas is a dignified and heroic Rank. Mr. Alexander Woolcott and Miss Lynn Fontanne are quite right in passionately assuring the public, over the air and from the stage, that it must not miss seeing the latest Nora.

STOP-OVER. It is the acting of a perfect cast that may save *Stop-Over*, written by Matt and Sam Taylor and produced at the Lyceum Theatre by Chase Productions, Inc. The producers have given us Arthur Byron and Sidney Blackmer for the two leading roles, and that combination should carry the play. Muriel Kirkland is tossed in for good measure, and the lesser actors are also vividly alive. If the play had proved equal to its company, its audiences would be entirely happy. As it is, they have a pretty good time following the adventures of a mixed group of men and women, held together one night in an old house, by an escaped convict who does not mean to be recaptured, and is not. There is a lot of human interest in that group. There is some comedy and pathos and drama in the play. Add to this the superb work of the company, and what more could a reasonable audience ask for an evening's entertainment?

ELIZABETH JORDAN

FILMS

A YANK AT OXFORD. Hollywood, having discovered and thoroughly investigated what it supposes to be the American college campus, lays a wistful eye on the historic spires of Oxford in this story of university life. The differences it finds are superficial and may be summed up by a shifting of emphasis from football to cricket or boating on the Thames. It is the same old story of the conceited young man who goes to college under the delusion that it has come to him, and learns humility, if nothing else, from a thorough hazing, except that, in this case, the brash student is set down in a strange and more picturesque milieu. Robert Taylor portrays the erring hero who clashes with his British cousins on points of schoolboy etiquette and especially antagonizes the brother of his heroine-elect. He is saved from dismissal when he demonstrates his ability to take his medicine gracefully. The direction of the film is leisurely enough to admit concentrated doses of atmosphere now and again. Besides Mr. Taylor, who does our collegiates no injury by his characterization, the cast includes Lionel Barrymore for sympathetic advice, Maureen O'Sullivan for romantic interest and Vivien Leigh and Edmund Gwenn for, perhaps, native inflections. There is a good deal of wholesome amusement for the family with an added lure for thwarted Rhodes Scholars. (MGM)

EVERYBODY SING. This is a melodic variation on the precocious child theme with the youngster leading her troubled parents out of their difficulties in jig time, or in something very like it. For the secret of her success in solving their financial muddle is found in a wholesale adoption of that hysterical rhythm known as "swing." It is a fast-moving and engaging production, but short on story interest. Judy Garland portrays the schoolgirl who introduces a new tempo into her singing class and is forthwith sent home to disrupt the family councils. While her actress mother and playwright father ponder their bills, Judy, with the aid of a versatile maid, embarks on a stage career of her own and saves the day. Allan Jones assists admirably in the musical sequences and Fannie Brice and Reginald Gardiner provide contrasting comedy techniques. Billie Burke and Reginald Owen fill out the cast of the sprightly, smoothly directed film which should amuse the family. (MGM)

RADIO CITY REVELS. The technique of writing popular songs comes in for a comedy exposition in what appears to be a crowded radio revue crossed with a quick glance at the script of *June Moon*. The song and dance sequences are interrupted every so often by a farcical plot involving two pseudo-tune-smiths who discover a source of inspiration in an innocent pupil from the wide open spaces. Keeping the Westerner, who composes songs in his sleep, productive and at the same time unaware of his peculiar talent, introduces most of the story complications. Bob Burns, Jack Oakie, Helen Broderick and Victor Moore make the most of their hilarious situations, against a satisfactory musical background. The film is recommended as good entertainment for the family circle. (RKO)

THE MIDNIGHT INTRUDER. The mechanical air which attaches to the development of this slight tale is not offset a great deal by any convincing performances on the part of its cast. The film progresses with a suggestion of grim effort behind its making and arouses little dramatic interest or suspense. Taking shelter in a deserted house, a down-and-out gambler is surprised into an imposture which involves him in a romance and a murder mystery. Eric Linden, Louis Hayward, Barbara Read and J. C. Nugent do the honors in this adult program picture. (Universal) THOMAS J. FITZMORRIS

EVENTS

EARLY returns from the week's events appeared to indicate the human race was growing harder. . . . A woman in British Columbia swallowed twenty-three six-inch spikes. . . . A nose with the power and range of an automobile horn was discovered in the Midwest. An awakened citizenry called the police, complained someone was tooting his auto horn, keeping the neighborhood awake. Rushing to the scene, officers discovered a man with a cold blowing his nose. . . . Later returns, however, created the suspicion the race was becoming softer. A would-be suicide jumped into a lake, found the water too cold for suicide. He yelled for help, was rescued. . . . New social customs continued emerging. . . . An Indiana farmer took his tractor for a joy-ride; zipped at top speed through city streets. Sirens screamed. A judge frowned. . . . For sinking his fangs into a man's leg after having been paroled for a similar offense, an Eastern dog was sentenced to death. The bitten man said the dog's bite was worse than his bark. . . . Bump highways loomed as a possibility. Doctors could not remove a metal object stuck in the throat of a young girl. It threatened to choke her. They rushed her to a hospital over an alleged road full of craters. As the car bumped up and down like a roller-coaster the metal was dislodged. Medical authorities, gratified by discovery of the new treatment, supported the suggestion that several transcontinental bump-highways be constructed to treat people who inadvertently get pieces of iron pipe or similar objects stuck in their throats. . . . Surprises characterized the week. . . . A Schenectady citizen, a light sleeper, was awakened by the entrance of a freight train into his bedroom. Tank cars brushed close to his bed. Finding the place "practically full of freight cars," the citizen admitted he felt sensations of surprise. . . . Science continued. After years of arduous toil, professors succeeded in doubling the life span of *daphnia longispina*, sometimes referred to as water fleas. . . . The profound faith in advertising held by American business men reached poignant heights. A full-page ad asking for rain appeared in a dust-bowl region newspaper. . . .

Why Not Department: Note from London to Italy: "His Majesty's Government feels it must urge that the Italian Ambassador to London be accredited to George VI not only as King but also as Emperor." . . . Note from Italy to London: "His Royal Italian Majesty's Government regrets profoundly its inability to recognize the British conquest of India and the consequent impossibility of accrediting its envoy to King George as Emperor of India." . . . Note from London to the League of Nations: "His British Majesty's Government hereby enters emphatic protest against the Italian refusal to recognize the English conquest of India. This refusal is a transparent attempt to place the British seizure of India on the same plane as the Italian seizure of Ethiopia. The Government of Great Britain feels it is unnecessary to point out that in taking over India, huge chunks of Africa, and other spots all over the globe Britain was motivated by the loftiest moral considerations such as the uplift of the natives and some other things, whereas in the Italian conquest of Ethiopia altruism appears to have played no part." . . . Headlines in American newspapers: "Italy Refuses to Recognize United States' Seizure of California, Puerto Rico, Panama Canal. . . . Peace-loving nations, Britain, France, United States, Praise Each Other's Exalted Motives. . . . The World's Two Great Democracies, Russia and Spain, Horrified: See World Threat in Italy." . . . League of Nations Proposal: "The criterion for past, present and future seizures of other peoples' territory shall be as follows: if the territory is seized by a peace-loving nation, the seizure shall be legal; if by a non-peace-loving nation, it shall be illegal." THE PARADER